

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Bath
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work and Applied Social Studies
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	12 – 13 May 2015

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 23 June 2015 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 30 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 3 July 2015. 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 27 August 2015.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession came onto the register in 2012 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 professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Teresa Rogers (Social worker in England) Paula Sobiechowska (Social worker in England) Kathleen Taylor (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	42 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Adrian Vatcher (University of the West of England)
Secretary	Alison Borgelin (University of Bath)
Members of the joint panel	Vijay Patel (The College of Social Work) Gary Hickman (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 55 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 approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors 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 can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit key programme documentation to ensure the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained instances of incorrect terminology. For example, the prospectus (Volume E, page 8) and website states, “You undertake a total of 170 days assessed practice plus 30 skill days, as required by the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC).” This statement refers to the requirements of the professional body, The College of Social Work. HCPC do not prescribe specific requirements regarding placement duration or skills days; education providers must meet the HCPC standards of education and training. The programme specification states: “The University of Bath is currently approved to deliver degrees in social work by the profession’s registering body the Health and Care Professionals (sic) Council (HCPC).” The Health and Care Professions Council approves programmes, rather than education providers, in its role as regulating body. The visitors also noted references to the previous regulator’s requirements, such as the “Code of Conduct and Ethics (HCPC)” (Placement Handbook, page 7) and the “National Occupational Standards for Social Work (NOSSW)” (Volume F, page 25). Incorrect and inconsistent statements have the potential to mislead applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation.

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 evidence how they implement appropriate protocols to obtain consent where students participate in practical teaching, such as roleplays.

Reason: The visitors noted from the evidence provided that there is a statement in each of the module handbooks acknowledging that students will be asked to engage in roleplays and discussions. The module handbooks also outline that students may opt out of the activity, and would be given ‘a replacement task of equal proportion’. However, the visitors could not find evidence of formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical roleplays. The visitors considered that without formal consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved where students participate as service users. The visitors also could not determine how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained, or how situations where students consistently declined from participation across modules were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme or annually) and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching or role play.

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 explicitly identify the attendance requirements for the programme, and clearly outline the monitoring mechanisms and follow-up actions.

Reason: The standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document referred the visitors to statements within the programme and placement handbooks as evidence for this SET. The Programme Handbook (page 11) outlines that students are expected to attend learning and teaching activities according to University of Bath Regulations. It highlights that, "Failure to maintain regular attendance can result in a student being 'precluded from continuing their studies and, where applicable, their registration [can] be terminated'". In discussion with the students, the visitors heard that further to the University of Bath Regulations, attendance is seen as a professional indicator on the programme, registers are taken, and that any absence is followed up by the module leader with alternative learning arrangements. Discussion with the programme team confirmed these arrangements, outlining that they implement attendance expectations at programme level, though the University of Bath does not require or enforce compulsory attendance. The visitors could not find an explicit statement in the documentation as to what the attendance requirement for this programme is, or the minimum level that is acceptable. Whilst the visitors noted that the practice placement handbook (page 12) states the requirement that "All students must complete 170 days of practice..." The visitors could not see how students were informed of the programme's expectations for university based elements of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how students are informed of the monitoring and follow-up procedures that are in place at programme level regarding non-attendance to taught elements of the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team are advised to revisit admissions information to ensure the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) opportunities available for applicants and the relevance to this programme is more easily accessible.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the admissions procedures give applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about the programme, and that AP(E)L is available to potential applicants. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard how the education provider would handle applications and were confident that the processes were in place to ensure appropriate admissions. However, the visitors found this difficult to find in the admissions documentation and therefore considered that prospective applicants may also have difficulty in locating the relevant information. In addition, the students in attendance at the visit did not appear aware of the AP(E)L process available at the education provider and its relevance for them in applying to the BSc (Hons) Social Work and Applied Social Studies programme, and the programme team indicated they could not recall receiving applications for AP(E)L. Therefore the visitors advise that the education provider revisits the admissions documentation to make this process clearer to prospective applicants.

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

Recommendation: The programme team are advised to ensure that the feedback gathered on placements is effectively used to inform and develop practice placement learning.

Reason: In discussions with practice placement providers and educators at the visit, the visitors heard the various forums for feedback and communication between the programme team and practice placement educators. From the evidence gathered at the visit, and the documentation, the visitors were assured that the systems in place for approval and ongoing monitoring of placements and practice placement educators was meeting this SET at threshold level. The visitors noted that students and practice placement educators evaluate the placement experience through the Quality Assurance of Practice Learning forms. The Student Placement Feedback QAPL Form, (Placement Handbook, page 62) outlines how the feedback will be used to inform processes and states that it is 'hoped' that the evaluation will be shared with practice placement educators. However, in discussions, the practice placement educators were not clear as to how the feedback students give following placements was fed back to them, or fed into reviews or action planning. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team monitor the communication channels around these feedback systems to ensure they continue to be as effective as possible in collaborating effectively with practice placement staff and monitoring the quality of placements.

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

Recommendation: The programme team are advised to pursue the implementation of anonymous marking as soon as possible, to ensure objectivity in the measurement of student performance.

Reason: The visitors noted comments from the external examiner in the 2012 – 2013 and 2013 – 2014 reports (Volume D, pages 30 and 86), regarding the practice of non-anonymous marking of assessments at the University of Bath. The visitors discussed the assessment and moderation policies in place at the education provider with the programme team at the visit, and were informed that anonymous marking was due to be rolled out from September 2015. The visitors were satisfied that the education provider's planned actions will meet this SET once implemented. However, the visitors recommend the programme team take any necessary pre-emptive steps at department level to ensure anonymous marking is implemented wherever reasonable, and as soon as possible for the programme, in order to ensure objectivity in the measurement of student performance.

Teresa Rogers
Paula Sobiechowska
Kathleen Taylor

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Birmingham Metropolitan College
Validating body / Awarding body	University of Wolverhampton
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Local anaesthetic Prescription only medicine
Date of visit	28 – 29 April 2015

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	10

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'chiroprapist' or 'podiatrist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 16 June 2015 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 30 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 3 July 2015. 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 27 August 2015.

Introduction

The HCPC 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 HCPC 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, professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Ian Prince (Lay visitor) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
HCPC observer	Jo Mussen
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort, per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Ruth Shiner (University of Wolverhampton)
Secretary	Rebecca Bates (University of Wolverhampton)
Members of the joint panel	Sharon Arkell (Internal panel member) Laura Clode (Internal panel member) Alison Felce (Internal panel Member) Gill Conde (Internal panel member) Wilfred Foxe (The College of Podiatry) Mairgreed Ellis (The College of Podiatry) Michelle Spruce (The College of Podiatry)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new. However, the visitors did review external examiners' reports for the current BSc (Hons) Podiatry validated by Aston University.

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Podiatry validated by Aston University as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining six SETs.

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

The visitors 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 can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation to ensure consistency and accuracy in line with statutory regulation.

Reason: Throughout the programme documentation, the visitors noted a number of inaccuracies. For example, page 165 of the Course Documents states “Attendance of 100% is compulsory at all clinical classes. This is a HCPC professional body requirement.” This is incorrect as HCPC does not prescribe the required attendance for a programme. This statement also references the HCPC as a professional body, the HCPC is not a professional body we are a regulatory body.

The visitors also noted that page 4 of the Programme Documentation states “Successful completion of the programme will make you eligible to register with the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC)” This is incorrect as, upon approval, successful completion of the programme will make students eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC, subject to further scrutiny.

The visitors also noted other inaccuracies within the documentation. The visitors note that this inaccuracy in information could be misleading to students in their understanding of the HCPC role and remit. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit all programme documentation to ensure consistency and accuracy in line with statutory regulation.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the availability of library resources appropriately supports students on the programme.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors were taken on a tour of the facilities which included visiting the library at the Matthew Boulton site of Birmingham Metropolitan College. The visitors noted that the space they visited was small and had a limited number of study areas available to students. In addition to this, in a meeting with students, it was voiced that they felt there were not enough learning spaces or library resources, particularly journals. It was felt that the library was noisy and therefore not an appropriate place to study. Students also stated that they had instead studied at home and purchased books personally. In a meeting with the programme team, the visitors heard that library resources and journal access would be increasing with the newly formed relationship with Wolverhampton University, however this was not yet in place. From the tour of facilities and statements made in meetings with students and the programme team, the visitors were unable to see how the resources available to students married up with the requirements of the programme. The visitors therefore require further information on the library resources available to students comparative to the requirements of the programme. In this way the visitors can ensure that appropriate learning resources are readily available to students on the programme.

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 signed by students prior to taking part in any clinical teaching to ensure students are giving informed consent.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were directed to the clinical teaching consent form which states “I agree to take part in the pre-clinical teaching sessions in order to understand and practice clinical podiatric care and management”. This visitors noted that there were no details provided on what ‘take part’ was to include and therefore noted that this was not informed consent. Further to this, in a meeting with students, it was stated that students could remember signing a consent form but were not sure what for. The visitors were satisfied that the consent was being signed by students, but again note that this was not informed consent. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the student consent form to ensure that consent given prior to taking part in clinical teaching is informed consent.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate the learning outcomes for the programme modules to clearly reflect the following standard of proficiency (SOP) with specific reference to the access and supply of prescription only medicines. This will ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for their part of the register.

14.11 be able to carry out the following techniques safely and effectively:

- administer relevant prescription-only medicines, interpret any relevant pharmacological history and recognise potential consequences for patient treatment
- apply local anaesthesia techniques
- carry out mechanical debridement of intact and ulcerated skin
- carry out surgical procedures for skin and nail conditions
- make and use chair-side foot orthoses
- manage nail disorders
- prescribe foot orthoses
- use appropriate physical and chemical therapies

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to locate, where in the curriculum, the above mentioned SOP is addressed. Specifically, the visitors could not locate where students would be taught how to interpret any relevant pharmacological history and recognise potential consequences for patient treatment when safely and effectively administering relevant prescription-only medicines available on exemptions. Further to this, in a meeting with students the visitors heard

that students were not confident in the delivery of access and supply of prescription only medicines. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to clearly articulate where the above SOP is delivered, specifically in relation to the access and supply of prescription only medicines available on exemptions. In this way the visitors can ensure that those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of monitoring mechanisms to ensure that all practice educators have attended and continue to attend practice educator training.

Reason: The visitors heard that practice educators have a number of opportunities within Birmingham Metropolitan College to undertake practice educator training as well as other further education courses. It was also stated that regular training sessions are run for practice educators at placement sites. However, the visitors were unable to identify any formal mechanisms in place to monitor the attendance of practice educators at these training sessions. In a meeting with the programme team, it was stated that there was no formal mechanism in place. The visitors note that without seeing a formal monitoring mechanism, they cannot be sure that all practice educators are, and will continue to be, appropriately trained in their role. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence which shows how they will monitor the attendance of practice educators to initial and refresher training sessions.

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 clearly articulate the assessment of learning outcomes for the programme modules to clearly reflect the following standard of proficiency (SOP) with specific reference to the access and supply of prescription only medicines. This will ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for their part of the register.

14.11 be able to carry out the following techniques safely and effectively:

- administer relevant prescription-only medicines, interpret any relevant pharmacological history and recognise potential consequences for patient treatment
- apply local anaesthesia techniques
- carry out mechanical debridement of intact and ulcerated skin
- carry out surgical procedures for skin and nail conditions
- make and use chair-side foot orthoses
- manage nail disorders
- prescribe foot orthoses

– use appropriate physical and chemical therapies

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to locate, where in the curriculum, the above mentioned SOP is addressed. Specifically, the visitors could not locate where students would be taught how to interpret any relevant pharmacological history and recognise potential consequences for patient treatment when safely and effectively administering relevant prescription-only medicines available on exemptions. Further to this, in a meeting with students the visitors heard that students were not confident in the delivery of access and supply of prescription only medicines. The visitors note that without seeing where in the curriculum this SOP is met, they cannot make a judgement on how this SOP is assessed. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to clearly articulate where the above SOP is assessed, specifically in relation to the access and supply of prescription only medicines available on exemptions. In this way the visitors can ensure that those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting staff numbers and individual workloads.

Reason: The visitors could see that the current staff numbers on the programme were adequate to deliver the programme effectively and were therefore satisfied that this standard is met at threshold level. However, through meetings with students and the programme team it became apparent that the programme team had particularly large workloads. The visitors heard that there was no designated administrator for the programme so all administrative tasks were shared amongst the teaching staff on the programme. In particular it was stated that one member of staff had worked an additional 37 hours in one month, on top of their contracted hours. In addition to this the visitors heard that there are a number of changes being implemented with the recent change of validating body to Wolverhampton University. The visitors noted that the stated changes would be enhancements to the programme and were likely to be more demanding of staff time. If the requirements of staff time increases, the visitors note there is a risk that the programme will not continue to be effectively delivered and therefore a risk of this standard falling below threshold level. The visitors therefore recommend the programme team revisits staffing numbers for the programme and their individual workloads.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team reconsiders when academic writing skills are taught on the programme.

Reason: The visitors could see that academic writing is taught at points throughout the curriculum and are therefore satisfied that this standard is met at threshold level. However, the visitors noted that the first sessions which specifically addressed academic writing skills were late into year one. The visitors also heard from students that they had handed in two written assignments before attending a session on academic writing. The students felt that this would have benefited them much more had they received the support before handing in their first assignment. The visitors note introducing this session after assignments have been handed in poses a risk to the demonstration of autonomous and reflective thinking of students in the first half of year 1 on the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team revisits the timing of this session to better support students in autonomous and reflective thinking in their written assignments.

James Pickard
Ian Prince
Catherine Smith

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme name	FD Health and Social Care (Paramedic Practice)
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	12 – 13 May 2015

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'paramedic' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 23 June 2015 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 30 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 August 2015. 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 27 August.

Introduction

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

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education 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 and role of HCPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Sue Boardman (Paramedic) Joanne Watchman (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort, two cohorts per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Ian Felstead (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Secretary	Lauren Smyth (Canterbury Christ Church University)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review the external examiner reports' from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice and FD Health and Social Care programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 55 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 approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the selection and entry criteria, including criminal conviction checks ensuring that the applicant is required to provide an up to date criminal conviction check when they apply for the programme.

Reason: For this standard, the documentation stated that as the applicants will be employed by South East Coast Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust (SECAMB) they will have a DBS check carried out by the employer. However, the visitors noted that when students will go on placement in a setting that is not with their current employer, the DBS check may not be current or applicable. The visitors noted that it is the responsibility of the education provider to run appropriate and relevant criminal conviction checks prior to their enrolment on the programme. Therefore the education provider must ensure that applicants demonstrate that they have a current criminal conviction check when they enter the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the entry requirements ensuring that applicants must adhere to any relevant health checks when they apply to the programme.

Reason: For this standard, the documentation stated that as the applicants will be employed by SECAMB they would have met any relevant occupational health clearance in line with the requirements for employment with SECAMB. However the visitors noted that the health checks for working in an Ambulance service may not be relevant for other non-ambulance placements such as an operating department. The visitors also noted that there was a potential risk to potential students when they are on placement if they do not have the relevant occupational health clearance. The visitors further noted that it is the responsibility of the education provider to ensure that applicants and potential students adhere to any relevant health check and have occupational health clearance. Therefore the education provider is required to ensure that any applicant and potential student adheres to any relevant health checks and occupational health clearance for the current range of placements as defined by the education provider.

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

Condition: The education provider is required to revise the documentation available to students and the assessment regulations so that they clearly outline the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the 'programme conventions' in the programme specification document on page 155 where there is a link to the education providers general academic conventions, therefore the visitors were unable to make a decision if the requirements for student progression for this programme were clear to students.. During the meeting with the programme team it was made clear that

modules are split between academic and practical assessment and that students must pass both parts of all modules in order to progress through the next level. It was also stated that students can only retake a module assessment once, and that if they are unable to pass the retake they are not allowed to progress on the programme. The visitors noted that this information is crucial to students on the programme and that this should be made explicit to students. Therefore the education provider must revise the documentation available to students and the assessment regulations so that they clearly outline the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Paul Bates
Sue Boardman
Joanne Watchman

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Middlesex University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	28 – 29 April 2015

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'biomedical scientist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 May 2015 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 30 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 June 2015. 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 27 August 2015.

Introduction

The HCPC 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 HCPC 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 HCPC only visit. The education provider 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 and role of HCPC visitors	Roseann Connolly (Lay visitor) David Houliston (Biomedical scientist) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	4 per cohort per year
First approved intake	September 2009
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2015
Chair	Diane Purchase (Middlesex University) Hemda Garlick (Middlesex University)
Secretary	Barry French (Middlesex University)

The education provider appointed two chairs, one for each day.

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

The HCPC did not meet with the service users and carers as they were unable to attend the visit

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 56 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 have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation, in particular the advertising materials, made available to potential applicants to clearly state the entry criteria for this programme.

Reason: As part of the information provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted in the programme handbook, page 43 "...overseas students whose first language is not English will need a qualification that demonstrates competence in English, e.g. IELTS 6". However, during discussions with the programme team it was revealed that overseas students whose first language is not English will need a qualification that demonstrates competence in English equivalent to IELTS 7. The visitors noted that this was not reflected in the programme documentation. The visitors consider information about English language selection and entry criteria to be essential for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants have the necessary information to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained several instances of incorrect terminology. For example, the clinical practice training manual, page 44 refers to the health professions council (HPC). All reference such as these must be updated to the 'HCPC' or 'Health and Care Professions Council'. Also, throughout the clinical practice training manual, reference is made to "HPC Registration" in the header of document. The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation submitted. Incorrect and inconsistent statements have the potential to mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, and ensure that the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation.

Roseann Connolly
David Houliston
Mary Popeck

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Middlesex University
Programme name	MSci Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	28 – 29 April 2015

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'biomedical scientist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 May 2015 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 30 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 June 2015. 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 27 August 2015.

Introduction

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

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider 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 a BSc Applied Biomedical science programme. A separate visitor report exists for this programme.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Roseann Connolly (Lay Visitor) David Houliston (Biomedical scientist) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	4 per cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Diane Purchase (Middlesex University) Hemda Garlick (Middlesex University)
Secretary	Barry French (Middlesex University)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

The HCPC did not meet with the service users and carers as they were unable to attend the visit.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 56 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 approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation, in particular the advertising materials, made available to potential applicants to clearly state the entry criteria for this programme.

Reason: As part of the information provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted in the programme handbook, page 43 "...overseas students whose first language is not English will need a qualification that demonstrates competence in English, e.g. IELTS 6". However, during discussions with the programme team it was revealed that overseas students whose first language is not English will need a qualification that demonstrates competence in English equivalent to IELTS 7. The visitors noted that this was not reflected in the programme documentation. The visitors consider information about English language selection and entry criteria to be essential for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants have the necessary information to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained several instances of incorrect terminology. For example, the clinical practice training manual, page 44 refers to the health professions council (HPC). All reference such as these must be updated to the 'HCPC' or 'Health and Care Professions Council'. Also, throughout the clinical practice training manual, reference is made to "HPC Registration" in the header of document. The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation submitted. Incorrect and inconsistent statements have the potential to mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, and ensure that the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation.

Roseann Connolly
David Houliston
Mary Popeck

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	21 – 22 May 2015

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2015 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 30 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 3 July 2015. 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 27 August 2015.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession came onto the register in 2012 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 professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BA Social Work and PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only). The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Clare Bates (Lay visitor) Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker in England) Gerry Mulcahy (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Byrom
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, one cohort per year including PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Penny Standen (University of Nottingham)
Secretary	Clare Barton / Angela Peer (University of Nottingham)
Members of the joint panel	Jane Lindsay (The College of Social Work) Kath Morris (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 55 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 approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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 further evidence how they implement appropriate protocols to obtain consent where students participate in practical teaching, such as roleplays, sharing of personal experiences and digital recording.

Reason: The visitors noted from the evidence provided that there is a statement in the student handbook acknowledging that students will be asked to engage in roleplays and experiential learning (page 24). In discussions with the students and the programme team, it was confirmed that participation in roleplays, sharing of personal experiences and digital recording were expectations of students throughout the programme. However, the visitors could not find evidence of formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated in practical teaching. The visitors considered that without formal consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved where students are involved in roleplaying scenarios and experiential work. The visitors also could not determine how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained, or how situations where students consistently declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme or annually) and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching or role play.

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 further evidence that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: The visitors were referred to information on alternative awards and exit routes from the programme in the programme specification and student handbook as evidence for this SET. In discussions with the senior team at the visit, it was confirmed that the education provider are able to give aegrotat awards. However, from the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not lead to eligibility to apply to the Register as a social worker in England. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to where the policy for aegrotat awards in relation to professional registration is laid out, and how students are informed about this.

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 further evidence that the assessment regulations specify requirements for the appointment of an external examiner who is

appropriately qualified and experienced, and from the relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors could not find detail concerning the recruitment and appointment criteria of external examiners to the programme in the documentation submitted by the education provider. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiner to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will be met.

Clare Bates
Vicki Lawson-Brown
Gerry Mulcahy

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
Programme name	PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	21 – 22 May 2015

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2015 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 30 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 3 July 2015. 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 27 August 2015.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession came onto the register in 2012 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 professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MA in Social Work and BA Social Work. The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Clare Bates (Lay visitor) Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker in England) Gerry Mulcahy (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Byrom
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, one cohort per year recruited to MA in Social Work
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Penny Standen (University of Nottingham)
Secretary	Clare Barton / Angela Peer (University of Nottingham)
Members of the joint panel	Jane Lindsay (The College of Social Work) Kath Morris (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 55 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 approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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 further evidence how they implement appropriate protocols to obtain consent where students participate in practical teaching, such as roleplays, sharing of personal experiences and digital recording.

Reason: The visitors noted from the evidence provided that there is a statement in the student handbook acknowledging that students will be asked to engage in roleplays and experiential learning (page 24). In discussions with the students and the programme team, it was confirmed that participation in roleplays, sharing of personal experiences and digital recording were expectations of students throughout the programme. However, the visitors could not find evidence of formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated in practical teaching. The visitors considered that without formal consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved where students are involved in roleplaying scenarios and experiential work. The visitors also could not determine how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained, or how situations where students consistently declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme or annually) and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching or role play.

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 further evidence that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: The visitors were referred to information on alternative awards and exit routes from the programme in the programme specification and student handbook as evidence for this SET. In discussions with the senior team at the visit, it was confirmed that the education provider are able to give aegrotat awards. However, from the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not lead to eligibility to apply to the Register as a social worker in England. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to where the policy for aegrotat awards in relation to professional registration is laid out, and how students are informed about this.

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 further evidence that the assessment regulations specify requirements for the appointment of an external examiner who is

appropriately qualified and experienced, and from the relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors could not find detail concerning the recruitment and appointment criteria of external examiners to the programme in the documentation submitted by the education provider. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiner to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will be met.

Clare Bates
Vicki Lawson-Brown
Gerry Mulcahy

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
Programme name	BA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	21 – 22 May 2015

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2015 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 30 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 3 July 2015. 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 27 August 2015.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession came onto the register in 2012 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 professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MA in Social Work and PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only). The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Clare Bates (Lay visitor) Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker in England) Gerry Mulcahy (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Byrom
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Penny Standen (University of Nottingham)
Secretary	Clare Barton / Angela Peer (University of Nottingham)
Members of the joint panel	Jane Lindsay (The College of Social Work) Kath Morris (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 55 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 approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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 further evidence how they implement appropriate protocols to obtain consent where students participate in practical teaching, such as roleplays, sharing of personal experiences and digital recording.

Reason: The visitors noted from the evidence provided that there is a statement in the student handbook acknowledging that students will be asked to engage in roleplays and experiential learning (page 19). In discussions with the students and the programme team, it was confirmed that participation in roleplays, sharing of personal experiences and digital recording were expectations of students throughout the programme. However, the visitors could not find evidence of formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated in practical teaching. The visitors considered that without formal consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved where students are involved in roleplaying scenarios and experiential work. The visitors also could not determine how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained, or how situations where students consistently declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme or annually) and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching or role play.

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 further evidence that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: The visitors were referred to information on alternative awards and exit routes from the programme in the programme specification and student handbook as evidence for this SET. In discussions with the senior team at the visit, it was confirmed that the education provider are able to give aegrotat awards. However, from the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not lead to eligibility to apply to the Register as a social worker in England. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to where the policy for aegrotat awards in relation to professional registration is laid out, and how students are informed about this.

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 further evidence that the assessment regulations specify requirements for the appointment of an external examiner who is

appropriately qualified and experienced, and from the relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors could not find detail concerning the recruitment and appointment criteria of external examiners to the programme in the documentation submitted by the education provider. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiner to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will be met.

Clare Bates
Vicki Lawson-Brown
Gerry Mulcahy

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	22 – 23 April 2015

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 8 June 2015 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 30 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 10 July 2015. 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 27 August 2015.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social worker profession came onto the register in August 2012 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 endorsement of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jane McLenachan(Social worker in England) Ian Hughes (Lay visitor) Kim Bown (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive officer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	40 per cohort, per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Ruth Weaver (University of Plymouth)
Secretary	Cirstie Rennie (University of Plymouth) Joanne Melhuish (University of Plymouth)
Members of the joint panel	Lynn Heath (The College of Social Work) Michael Branicki (The College of Social Work) Peter Wild (External Panel Member) Janet Warren (External Panel Member) Peter Wild (External Panel Member) Janet Warren (External Panel Member) Ann Humphreys (Internal Panel Member) Jo Triplett (Internal Panel Member) Sharon Wilkinson (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining eight SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information to clarify the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there is an accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy in place for the programme. The visitors noted that there is a thorough matching process between an applicant's prior learning and the learning outcomes of the programme. However, whilst the programme specification mentions AP(E)L, the visitors could not see how applicants to the programme would be informed about the process, told what amount of credit could be considered through AP(E)L, and whether practice learning could be transferred or not. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the education provider informs potential applicants of the AP(E)L policy and process for the programme. This will ensure that applicants are given the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme.

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 provide further information on how they ensure potential overseas applicants are fully informed of the requirements for entry to programme in regards to disclosure and barring service (DBS).

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit demonstrated DBS checks were undertaken appropriately through the admissions processes. However, discussions with the students revealed that overseas students are expected to obtain an equivalent DBS clearance from their home country. The visitors noted the programme advertising materials online and programme documentation did not include explicit information about the requirements for DBS checks for overseas applicants. The visitors consider information about the DBS checks to be important to enable potential overseas applicants to make informed decisions about this programme. This includes the requirement for the DBS checks, information about the level required from their country and why this is needed along with details about the process. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they ensure potential overseas applicants to the programme are fully informed about the DBS checks required for the admissions procedures.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained several instances of incorrect terminology and information. For example, page 21 of the MA Social Work handbook states “The University is accredited by the Health Care Professions Council (HCPC)”. The HCPC does not accredit Universities, instead we approve health and care education and training programmes, therefore this statement is incorrect. In addition, the visitors noted page 52 of the same document, “Health and Care Professionals Council (HCPC)”. This should read “Health and Care Professions Council” or “HCPC”. The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation submitted. Incorrect and inconsistent statements have the potential to mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, and ensure that the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of any changes to the programme documentation following the approval visit.

Reason: Through discussion at the visit, and from the final conclusions of the internal validation and external visiting panel it was clear that revisions will be made to programme documentation to meet conditions set by internal panel. The visitors consider the programme documentation that students routinely refer to as an important resource to support student learning. In particular, the conditions set by internal panel referred to amendments to module descriptors and the programme specification document. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors need to review revised documentation to ensure the resources to support student learning are effectively used. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit the revised programme documentation the students routinely refer to.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the complaints process is clearly articulated in the programme documentation for students.

Reason: From a review of programme documentations, the visitors noted that the education provider has an institution wide student complaints process. The visitors were satisfied that this process ensures that students concerns and complaints are dealt with. However, from a review of the documentation submitted for this programme, the visitors were unable to find reference to the student complaints process. The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the complaints process is clearly articulated to 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 programme team must provide evidence of the protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users in practical sessions.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided by the programme team prior to the visit, and noted that the documentation provided gave no specific details of how consent is obtained for this programme. During the course of the visit, the visitors were presented with a consent form and were informed that the intention is to introduce the form during induction week where students will be expected to sign it, and the process will then be repeated annually. From the documentation, the visitors were unable to see where this was documented, or how students were informed about the requirement for them to participate, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained and the process for checking this annually. Furthermore, the visitors could also not determine how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of the formal protocols that are in place to obtain informed consent.

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 provide evidence to identify where attendance is mandatory, where students are informed of this within the programme documentation and how attendance is monitored across all elements of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors could not identify what the attendance requirements for students were across the programme. The visitors were also unclear as to how students are informed about the elements of the programme where attendance is mandatory. In discussion with the programme team, it was clarified that student' attendance is mandatory across all practical elements of the programme and that this is monitored closely. However, it was also highlighted that while full attendance was expected at all taught modules an attendance sheet was not completed for every module session. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to clarify where attendance is mandatory for students, and the effects non-attendance may have on their progression through the programme. The visitors also require further evidence of how attendance throughout the course of the programme is monitored, and at what point the programme team would intervene if attendance became an issue.

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 revise the programme documentation to clearly articulate the process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct and how this process will be communicated to students.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted the references made to the "University Fitness for Practice" procedure (Programme handbook, page 5). However, the documentation submitted did not provided any detail of the "University Fitness for Practice" procedure or how this process in place deals with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. In discussions at the visit, the visitors were made aware that there is clear, definitive, formal procedure for dealing with issues around student professional conduct. The programme team spoke in detail of the process in place and how it ensures issues of fitness to practice are dealt with clearly and

consistently. From the discussion, the visitors were satisfied that there is a process in place. However, the visitors noted that the process discussed at visit, is not reflected in the programme documentation. The visitors were unsure how, if the process is not recorded in the programme documentation, information regarding fitness to practice is communicated to students, or how students are made aware of the criteria used to determine when an issues around students' profession related conduct is referred to the fitness to practice procedure. Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to clearly articulate the process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct and evidence of how this process will be communicated to students. In this way the visitors can determine if this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine where in the programme documentation a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards was. This SET requires the programme documentation to clearly state that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require the education provider to update the programme documentation, to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is 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 provide further evidence which makes clear in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

Jane McLenachan
Ian Hughes
Kim Bown

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme name	PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	22 – 23 April 2015

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 8 June 2015 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 30 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 10 July 2015. 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 27 August 2015.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social worker profession came onto the register in August 2012 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 endorsement of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jane McLenachan(Social worker in England) Ian Hughes (Lay visitor) Kim Bown (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive officer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	60 per cohort, per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2016
Chair	Ruth Weaver (University of Plymouth)
Secretary	Cirstie Rennie (University of Plymouth) Joanna Melhuish (University of Plymouth)
Members of the joint panel	Lynn Heath (The College of Social Work) Michael Branicki (The College of Social Work) Peter Wild (External Panel Member) Janet Warren (External Panel Member) Jo Triplett (Internal Panel Member) Sharon Wilkinson (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining eight SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information to clarify the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there is an accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy in place for the programme. The visitors noted that there is a thorough matching process between an applicant's prior learning and the learning outcomes of the programme. However, whilst the programme specification mentions AP(E)L, the visitors could not see how applicants to the programme would be informed about the process, told what amount of credit could be considered through AP(E)L, and whether practice learning could be transferred or not. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the education provider informs potential applicants of the AP(E)L policy and process for the programme. This will ensure that applicants are given the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme.

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 provide further information on how they ensure potential overseas applicants are fully informed of the requirements for entry to programme in regards to disclosure and barring service (DBS).

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit demonstrated DBS checks were undertaken appropriately through the admissions processes. However, discussions with the students revealed that overseas students are expected to obtain an equivalent DBS clearance from their home country. The visitors noted the programme advertising materials online and programme documentation did not include explicit information about the requirements for DBS checks for overseas applicants. The visitors consider information about the DBS checks to be important to enable potential overseas applicants to make informed decisions about this programme. This includes the requirement for the DBS checks, information about the level required from their country and why this is needed along with details about the process. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they ensure potential overseas applicants to the programme are fully informed about the DBS checks required for the admissions procedures.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained several instances of incorrect terminology and information. For example, page 21 of the MA Social Work handbook states “The University is accredited by the Health Care Professions Council (HCPC)”. The HCPC does not accredit Universities, instead we approve health and care education and training programmes, therefore this statement is incorrect. In addition, the visitors noted page 52 of the same document, “Health and Care Professionals Council (HCPC)”. This should read “Health and Care Professions Council” or “HCPC”. The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation submitted. Incorrect and inconsistent statements have the potential to mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, and ensure that the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of any changes to the programme documentation following the approval visit.

Reason: Through discussion at the visit, and from the final conclusions of the internal validation and external visiting panel it was clear that revisions will be made to programme documentation to meet conditions set by internal panel. The visitors consider the programme documentation that students routinely refer to as an important resource to support student learning. In particular, the conditions set by internal panel referred to amendments to module descriptors and the programme specification document. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors need to review revised documentation to ensure the resources to support student learning are effectively used. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit the revised programme documentation the students routinely refer to.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the complaints process is clearly articulated in the programme documentation for students.

Reason: From a review of programme documentations, the visitors noted that the education provider has an institution wide student complaints process. The visitors were satisfied that this process ensures that students concerns and complaints are dealt with. However, from a review of the documentation submitted for this programme, the visitors were unable to find reference to the student complaints process. The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the complaints process is clearly articulated to 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 programme team must provide evidence of the protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users in practical sessions.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided by the programme team prior to the visit, and noted that the documentation provided gave no specific details of how consent is obtained for this programme. During the course of the visit, the visitors were presented with a consent form and were informed that the intention is to introduce the form during induction week where students will be expected to sign it, and the process will then be repeated annually. From the documentation, the visitors were unable to see where this was documented, or how students were informed about the requirement for them to participate, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained and the process for checking this annually. Furthermore, the visitors could also not determine how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of the formal protocols that are in place to obtain informed consent.

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 provide evidence to identify where attendance is mandatory, where students are informed of this within the programme documentation and how attendance is monitored across all elements of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors could not identify what the attendance requirements for students were across the programme. The visitors were also unclear as to how students are informed about the elements of the programme where attendance is mandatory. In discussion with the programme team, it was clarified that student' attendance is mandatory across all practical elements of the programme and that this is monitored closely. However, it was also highlighted that while full attendance was expected at all taught modules an attendance sheet was not completed for every module session. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to clarify where attendance is mandatory for students, and the effects non-attendance may have on their progression through the programme. The visitors also require further evidence of how attendance throughout the course of the programme is monitored, and at what point the programme team would intervene if attendance became an issue.

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 revise the programme documentation to clearly articulate the process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct and how this process will be communicated to students.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted the references made to the "University Fitness for Practice" procedure (Programme handbook, page 5). However, the documentation submitted did not provided any detail of the "University Fitness for Practice" procedure or how this process in place deals with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. In discussions at the visit, the visitors were made aware that there is clear, definitive, formal procedure for dealing with issues around student professional conduct. The programme team spoke in detail of the process in place and how it ensures issues of fitness to practice are dealt with clearly and

consistently. From the discussion, the visitors were satisfied that there is a process in place. However, the visitors noted that the process discussed at visit, is not reflected in the programme documentation. The visitors were unsure how, if the process is not recorded in the programme documentation, information regarding fitness to practice is communicated to students, or how students are made aware of the criteria used to determine when an issues around students' profession related conduct is referred to the fitness to practice procedure. Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to clearly articulate the process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct and evidence of how this process will be communicated to students. In this way the visitors can determine if this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine where in the programme documentation a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards was. This SET requires the programme documentation to clearly state that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require the education provider to update the programme documentation, to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is 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 provide further evidence which makes clear in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

Jane McLenachan
Ian Hughes
Kim Bown

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	22 – 23 April 2015

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 8 June 2015 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 30 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 10 July 2015. 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 27 August 2015.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social worker profession came onto the register in August 2012 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 endorsement of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jane McLenachan (Social worker in England) Ian Hughes (Lay visitor) Kim Bown (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive officer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	60 per cohort, per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Ruth Weaver (University of Plymouth)
Secretary	Cirstie Rennie (University of Plymouth) Joanne Melhuish (University of Plymouth)
Members of the joint panel	Lynn Heath (The College of Social Work) Michael Branicki (The College of Social Work) Peter Wild (External Panel Member) Janet Warren (External Panel Member) Ann Humphreys (Internal Panel Member) Jo Triplett (Internal Panel Member) Sharon Wilkinson (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information to clarify the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there is an accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy in place for the programme. The visitors noted that there is a thorough matching process between an applicant's prior learning and the learning outcomes of the programme. However, whilst the programme specification mentions AP(E)L, the visitors could not see how applicants to the programme would be informed about the process, told what amount of credit could be considered through AP(E)L, and whether practice learning could be transferred or not. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the education provider informs potential applicants of the AP(E)L policy and process for the programme. This will ensure that applicants are given the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme.

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 provide further information on how they ensure potential overseas applicants are fully informed of the requirements for entry to programme in regards to disclosure and barring service (DBS).

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit demonstrated DBS checks were undertaken appropriately through the admissions processes. However, discussions with the students revealed that overseas students are expected to obtain an equivalent DBS clearance from their home country. The visitors noted the programme advertising materials online and programme documentation did not include explicit information about the requirements for DBS checks for overseas applicants. The visitors consider information about the DBS checks to be important to enable potential overseas applicants to make informed decisions about this programme. This includes the requirement for the DBS checks, information about the level required from their country and why this is needed along with details about the process. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they ensure potential overseas applicants to the programme are fully informed about the DBS checks required for the admissions procedures.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained several instances of incorrect terminology and information. For example, page 8 of the BA Operational specification states, “The Health & Social Care Council requires that students complete 170 days of supervised and assessed practice”. This should read as ‘Health and Care Professions Council’. In addition, the HCPC does not have prescriptive requirements in terms of hours of practice. The HCPC’s requirements around placement are for the education provider to demonstrate that students who complete their programme meet the standards of proficiency. Also, the visitors noted on the Practice Placement Handbook, page 15 “The HCPC requires a 100% feedback return”. The visitors were unsure what this statement meant. The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation and feel that incorrect and inaccurate statements may mislead students and provide an incorrect impression of the HCPC as a statutory regulator. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of any changes to the programme documentation following the approval visit.

Reason: Through discussion at the visit, and from the final conclusions of the internal validation and external visiting panel it was clear that revisions will be made to programme documentation to meet conditions set by internal panel. The visitors consider the programme documentation that students routinely refer to as an important resource to support student learning. In particular, the conditions set by internal panel referred to amendments to module descriptors and the programme specification document. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors need to review revised documentation to ensure the resources to support student learning are effectively used. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit the revised programme documentation the students routinely refer to.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of the protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users in practical sessions.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided by the programme team prior to the visit, and noted that the documentation provided gave no specific details of how consent is obtained for this programme. During the course of the visit, the visitors were presented with a consent form and were informed that the intention is to introduce the form during induction week where students will be expected to sign it, and the process will then be repeated annually. From the documentation, the visitors were unable to see where this was documented, or how students were informed about the requirement for them to participate, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained and the process for checking this annually. Furthermore, the visitors could also not determine how situations where students declined from participation were managed

with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of the formal protocols that are in place to obtain informed consent.

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 provide evidence to identify where attendance is mandatory, where students are informed of this within the programme documentation and how attendance is monitored across all elements of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors could not identify what the attendance requirements for students were across the programme. The visitors were also unclear as to how students are informed about the elements of the programme where attendance is mandatory. In discussion with the programme team, it was clarified that students' attendance is mandatory across all practical elements of the programme and that this is monitored closely. However, it was also highlighted that while full attendance was expected at all taught modules an attendance sheet was not completed for every module session. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to clarify where attendance is mandatory for students, and the effects non-attendance may have on their progression through the programme. The visitors also require further evidence of how attendance throughout the course of the programme is monitored, and at what point the programme team would intervene if attendance became an issue.

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 revise the programme documentation to clearly articulate the process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct and how this process will be communicated to students.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted the references made to the "University Fitness for Practice" procedure (Programme handbook, page 38). However, the documentation submitted did not provide any detail of the "University Fitness for Practice" procedure or how this process in place deals with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. In discussions at the visit, the visitors were made aware that there is clear, definitive, formal procedure for dealing with issues around student professional conduct. The programme team spoke in detail of the process in place and how it ensures issues of fitness to practice are dealt with clearly and consistently. From the discussion, the visitors were satisfied that there is a process in place. However, the visitors noted that the process discussed at visit, is not reflected in the programme documentation. The visitors were unsure how, if the process is not recorded in the programme documentation, information regarding fitness to practice is communicated to students, or how students are made aware of the criteria used to determine when an issues around students' profession related conduct is referred to the fitness to practice procedure. Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to clearly articulate the process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related

conduct and evidence of how this process will be communicated to students. In this way the visitors can determine if this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine where in the programme documentation a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards was. This SET requires the programme documentation to clearly state that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require the education provider to update the programme documentation, to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is 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 provide further evidence which makes clear in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

Jane McLenachan
Ian Huges
Kim Bown

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	21 - 22 April 2012

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	9

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'paramedic' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 16 June 2015 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 30 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 31 July 2015. 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 27 August 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Bob Fellows (Paramedic) Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Susanne Roff (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ben Potter
Proposed student numbers	50 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Jason Oakley (University of Portsmouth)
Secretary	Nikki Coleman (University of Portsmouth) Beckie Isaia (University of Portsmouth)
Members of the joint panel	Graham Harris (College of Paramedics) Samantha Hogan (College of Paramedics)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review the external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as this programme is new and currently has no external examiner.

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the FdSc Paramedic Science as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

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

The visitors 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 can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence as to how they ensure that applicants to the programme are aware of the requirement to have achieved certain GCSE's in order to successfully gain a place on the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided prior to the visit that there was no explicit statement in the programme documentation which outlined the requirement for applicants to have any GCSE's in order for them to successfully be offered a place on the programme. In discussions at the visit the visitors were made aware that it was an institutional policy not to include the requirements for GCSE's in programme documentation or on programmes' advertising material. Programmes are instead required to set out their requirements for entry such as any university and college admissions service (UCAS) points or any requirement for 'A' levels or equivalent awards in specific subjects. In further discussions the visitors were made aware that there is an institutional requirement for applicants to have a minimum of three GCSE passes (at A*-C) and that applicants should have passed GCSE English and mathematics. However the visitors could not determine, from the evidence provided, how applicants would be made aware of the requirements for them to have achieved the relevant GCSE's in order to be offered a place on this programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence about how the education provider will ensure that applicants are aware of the requirement to have achieved certain GCSE's in order to be offered a place on this programme. In this way they can then determine how the programme may meet this standard.

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 provide further evidence as to how and when they will implement the areas of the strategic plan which will involve the recruitment of additional staff to supplement the delivery of the programme.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were aware that the programme team would be delivering this programme in addition to their current roles delivering a foundation science degree (FdSc) programme in paramedic science. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that the FdSc programme would not continue to recruit new students if this programme was successful in gaining approval from the HCPC. As such the programme team would have a brief period of time when both programmes would run together. The programme team also clarified that there would be an increased number of students, in total, studying this three year programme when compared to the two year FdSc programme due to the additional cohort of students. In discussion with the senior management team the visitors highlighted this increase in workload for the current programme team and it was clarified that there was a strategic plan in place to recruit additional staff to ensure that the team were of a sufficient size to deliver this programme going forward. However, the visitors were not provided with any documentary evidence regarding this and were unclear from the discussions how and when the plan to recruit additional staff to the programme would be implemented. The visitors therefore require further evidence to

demonstrate how, and when, the education provider will recruit additional staff to the programme team to supplement the delivery of the programme. In this way the visitors will be able to determine if there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme going forward.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that practice placement educators in non-ambulance settings have the required knowledge, skills and experience to educate students from this programme.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit the visitors were aware that students will be expected to undertake placements in both ambulance trust settings and in non-ambulance trust settings. The visitors were made aware at the visit that the placement provision in ambulance trust settings is centrally co-ordinated between the education provider's faculty placement office and the South Central Ambulance Service NHS Trust (SCAS). They were also informed that there is a process and policy in place whereby paramedics employed by SCAS are put forward to be trained by the education provider and become practice placement educators for students on this programme. These practice placement educators are then held on a list by SCAS who inform the education provider as and when students have been allocated placements where they will be supervised by these trained members of staff. In discussion with the practice placement educators the visitors were made aware that the arrangements in non-ambulance settings were not the same and could vary from one setting to another. They heard that the local NHS trusts offering non-ambulance placements maintain lists of those people in hospitals who act as placement educators for students from other professions and as such they would determine who is available to mentor students from this programme when the placements are required. The visitors also heard that there currently aren't any arrangements in place to train all of the placement educators in non-ambulance placements to educate students from this programme but there is confidence that this can be done. As such the visitors are unclear as to how the education provider will ensure that practice placement educators in non-ambulance placement settings will have the knowledge, skills and experience to educate students from this programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider will ensure that where students are being supervised or educated in a non-ambulance setting this will be done by a practice placement educator who has all of the skills and experience required to provide students from this programme with the placement experience they require.

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 programme team must provide further evidence about how students and practice placement educators in non-ambulance settings are fully prepared for placement and understand who is responsible for which aspects of the placement experience.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit the visitors were aware that students will be expected to undertake placements in both ambulance trust settings and in non-ambulance trust settings. The visitors were made aware at the visit that the placement provision in ambulance trust settings is centrally co-ordinated between the education provider's faculty placement office and the South Central Ambulance Service NHS Trust (SCAS). They were also informed that there is a process and policy in place whereby paramedics employed by SCAS are put forward to be trained by the education provider and become practice placement educators for students on this programme. These practice placement educators are then held on a list by SCAS who inform the education provider as and when students have been allocated placements where they will be supervised by these trained members of staff. Employment practices and roles and responsibilities for practice placement educators at SCAS and the education provider are also included in students' practice placement handbooks. However, in discussion with the practice placement educators the visitors were made aware that the arrangements in non-ambulance settings were not the same and could vary from one setting to another. They also heard in further discussions that students felt less sure how to raise concerns about non-ambulance placements and less sure about who was responsible for which aspects of placement as the faculty placement office sites students for non-ambulance placements but the student and the placement provider agree on the experience that they will have. As such the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensures that students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement in non-ambulance settings. In particular they were unsure about the lines of responsibility for the different aspects of non-ambulance placements and how any issues would be dealt with if they arose. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the education provider will prepare everyone involved in non-ambulance practice placements and how everyone will be made aware of who is responsible for which aspects of the placement.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how best to ensure that the programme team continues to have sufficient time to pursue any personal or professional development activities as required.

Reason: From the evidence provided the visitors noted that there is a personal development policy for all members of staff at the education provider and that the programme team have been provided the opportunity to pursue further study in addition to their roles in delivering this programme. The visitors were therefore content that this standard is met by the programme. However, in discussion with the programme team and the senior team it was highlighted that there would be an additional workload associated with the delivery of this programme and in particular when there will be an increased workload during the cross-over between the existing provision and this new programme. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider continues to monitor the workload of the current programme team to ensure that there is sufficient time for them to pursue personal development goals and further academic study should they require it. In this way the education provider may better ensure that the programme team can develop in line with the increased burden that will be placed on them through the delivery of this new programme.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider how they will develop the use of service users and carers in the programme and how they can be best used to aid the delivery of the programme in the future.

Reason: From the evidence provided at the visit, the visitors noted that there is a dedicated, active group of service users and carers who are involved in the delivery of the programme. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that the programme has met this standard. However, the visitors noted that the service users and carers are all from the same charitable group and their participation is dependent on their availability and not necessarily the requirements of the programme team. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team continues to develop the inclusion of service users and carers in the programme and look, where possible, to involve service users and carers from a greater variety of backgrounds and walks of life. In this way the programme team may better be able to increase pool of service users and carers who will be able to contribute to the programme. By increasing the available pool of service users and carers the programme team could also be better placed to consider how service users and carers may be included in other aspects of the programme to enhance students' learning.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how best to continue monitoring the number, and availability, of practice placement educators.

Reason: From the evidence provided the visitors were made aware that SCAS and the education provider work in partnership to ensure that sufficient numbers of practice placement educators are available to supervise students at the ambulance placements. Therefore the visitors were content that the programme meets this standard. However, in discussion with the senior team and the practice placement providers the visitors were made aware that there is a high turnover of practice placement educators currently with a number leaving the employment of the SCAS trust, in common with all other areas of the UK. The visitors were also made aware that the list of available practice placement educators is provided to the education provider on an annual basis as part of the ongoing approval and monitoring of practice placements. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider considers how best to work with SCAS to monitor the availability of practice placement educators and considers how best mitigate the situation should a number of them leave the trust's employment at any one time. In this way the education provider, and ambulance trust, may be better placed to deal with this should a situation such as this arise and plans can be put in place to avoid any potential disruption to the programme and students' placement experiences.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider awarding credit to those practice placement educators who successfully complete the relevant practice placement educator training.

Reason:

As part of the required training that a practice placement educator undertakes prior to supervising any student in practice potential educators must complete the education providers' supporting lecturers in practice (SLP) training. This is backed up with annual refresher training modules that practice placement educators complete via distance learning. As such the visitors were satisfied that the programme has met this standard. However, in discussion with the practice placement providers and programme team the visitors were made aware that anyone successfully completing the SLP training is not awarded with any academic credit for having done so. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider considers awarding academic credit to anyone who successfully completes this training. In this way the education provider may be better placed to attract greater numbers of professionals to undertake the role of practice placement educator for this programme.

Susanne Roff
Mark Nevins
Bob Fellows

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of visit	9–10 June 2015

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'operating department practitioner' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 14 July 2015 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 30 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 June 2015. 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 27 August 2015.

Introduction

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

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider 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 and role of HCPC visitors	Clare Bates (Lay visitor) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	70 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Doug Emery (Sheffield Hallam University)
Secretary	Helen Garner (Sheffield Hallam University)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new. The visitors did review external examiners' reports from the Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice.

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 55 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 approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further clarity on the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) requirements for the programme and how students will meet the HCPC requirements upon successful completion of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that there was a discrepancy in the documentation regarding the IELTS requirements for the programme. For example the ODP Recruitment Handbook states “If English is not the first language an IELTS score of 7.0 with a minimum of 5.5 in all skills or equivalent” whereas the definitive document, page 13 states “If English is not your first language you must have an IELTS score of 6.5 with a minimum of 5.5 in all skills or equivalent”. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that there was some uncertainty around the IELTS entry requirements for the programme and this was currently being looked into. The visitors noted that without confirmation of the IELTS requirements for the programme they are unable to make a judgement on this standard being met. In addition to this, the visitors noted that, should the IELTS requirements reflect those stated in the definitive document (IELTS score of 7.0 with a minimum of 5.5 in all skills or equivalent) they will need to see further evidence of how the programme ensures that students will be brought up to an IELTS level 7.0 with a minimum of 6.5 in all skills or equivalent upon successful completion of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to clarify the IELTS entry requirements for the programme, and, if necessary, how students will be supported to reach the appropriate level upon graduation.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation to ensure accurate reflection of the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) requirements for the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided and in meetings throughout the visit, the visitors were able to see that DBS checks were a compulsory part of the admissions process and were also satisfied with the process for applying this. However, the visitors noted that page 5 of the ODP Recruitment Handbook states “...provide us with a copy of DBS Enhanced Disclosure Certificate if requested”. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that DBS checks were compulsory for the programme, they noted that this information could be misleading to an applicant or student on the programme. In particular it was noted that the current wording could suggest that DBS requirements were not compulsory. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the wording and terminology accurately reflects the requirements of the programme and the HCPC.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation to ensure it accurately reflects the learning outcomes for the Enhanced Perioperative Practice module.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that on page 120 of the definitive document, one of tasks states “taking the student from the competent student practitioner to the final enhance practitioner ready for registration who will be able to; Practice Anaesthesia”. The visitors were unsure as to the scope of this statement, and, in particular, were concerned that this could suggest that a student will have to deliver anaesthesia to meet this particular learning outcome. They also noted that it is not within the scope of safe and effective practice for operating department practitioners to deliver anaesthetic. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that this was an error in the documentation and that student would not be expected to deliver anaesthesia to meet this particular learning outcome. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that this was an error in the documentation, they noted that this statement could be misleading to both students and practice placement educators. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the learning outcomes for the Advanced Perioperative Practice module to ensure that they reflect the desired learning outcomes of the programme and the scope of safe and effective practice for operating department practitioners.

Clare Bates
Penny Joyce
Andrew Steel

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Staffordshire University
Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Clinical Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Clinical psychologist
Date of visit	15 – 16 April 2015

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'practitioner psychologist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 28 May 2015 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 30 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 01 June 2015. 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 30 June 2015.

Introduction

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

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider 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 and role of HCPC visitors	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) Stephen Davies (Clinical psychologist) Louise Whittle (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Andrea Bailey (Staffordshire University)
Secretary	Jackie Campbell (Staffordshire University)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new. However, the visitors did review external examiners reports from Professional Doctorate in Clinical Psychology programme jointly validated by Keele and Staffordshire University.

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the Professional Doctorate in Clinical Psychology programme jointly validated by Keele and Staffordshire University, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining two SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained incorrect terminology. For example, the programme specification on page 5 states “the British Psychological Society and HCPC require much of the teaching to be delivered by Registered Psychologists”. In another example on page 7, it states “The Doctorate in Clinical Psychology confers eligibility to register with the Health and Care Professions Council”. These statements are incorrect as HCPC do not prescribe teaching must be delivered by registered psychologists, instead education providers must have adequate number of appropriately qualified staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver an effective programme. Similarly, successful completion of an approved programme makes student eligible to apply for registration with HCPC and does not automatically confers eligibility to register. Therefore, visitors require the programme documentation to be reviewed to remove any instances of incorrect terminology. In this way the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available to support students’ learning are being effectively used and that this standard can be met.

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 to clearly state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation.

Sabiha Azmi
Stephen Davies
Louise Whittle