hcpc
health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Birmingham
Programme name	Practice Certificate in Independent Prescribing for Pharmacists/Nurses/Physiotherapists/Podiatrists.
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Date of visit	8 June 2016

Contents

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 a protected title 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.

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register, the HCPC also approve a small number of programmes for those already on the Register. The post-registration programmes we currently approve include supplementary prescribing programmes (for chiropodists / podiatrists, dietitians, radiographers and physiotherapists) and independent prescribing programmes (for chiropodists / podiatrists, physiotherapists, and therapeutic radiographers).

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 11 July 2016 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 7 July 2016. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 1 August 2016. 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 25 August 2016.

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 our standards for prescribing for education providers and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional bodies 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	Nicola Carey (Independent prescriber) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
HCPC observer	Ben Potter
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort, two cohorts per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2016
Chair	John Skelton (University of Birmingham)
Secretary	Sarah Turner (University of Birmingham)

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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the standards for prescribing for education providers	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the standards for prescribing for all prescribers and / or independent prescribers	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

The HCPC did not review the external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiners' report 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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the Practice Certificate in Independent Prescribing for Pharmacists and the MSc Physiotherapy programmes 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 assured that the programme meets all of our standards for prescribing for education providers and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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 48 of the standards have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining two standards.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

A.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 is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate how the admissions procedures give the applicant the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the student handbook and application form which stated the admissions process and criteria for the programme. However, the visitors noted that the student handbook is a document that applicants would receive once they have been accepted onto the programme. From this evidence the visitors could not determine how a potential applicant would access the information they require, such as the admissions procedure and entry requirements, to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme. During the meeting with the programme team it was stated that the website would contain all the information required about the programme, however the website is currently under development and could therefore not be reviewed by the visitors. Without this information the visitors were unable to determine how the programme can meet this standard. The visitors therefore require evidence which demonstrates how the admissions procedures give applicants the information they require, including the admissions process and entry requirements, to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

A.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 is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate how the admissions procedures give the applicant the information they require on accreditation of prior (experiential) learning to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Reason: The visitors met with the programme team who stated that an applicant could not enter the programme through the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) process, the visitors noted that this information was not clear in the information available to potential applicants. Without this information the visitors were unable to determine how the programme can meet this standard. During the same meeting with the programme team it was stated that the website would contain all the information required about the programme, however the website is currently under development and could therefore not be reviewed by the visitors. Without this information the visitors were unable to determine how the programme can meet this standard. The visitors therefore require evidence which demonstrates how the admissions procedures give applicants the information they require, including the AP(E)L policy, to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

A.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 is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate how they communicate the requirements for completing the programme to potential applicants.

Reason: The visitors met with the programme team who stated that a student must complete the two modules consecutively in order to complete the programme and be eligible for registration with HCPC as an independent prescriber. As the two modules are separate entities it is important to be explicit that they must be completed as a single course of learning. However, the visitors were unable to locate where this information was stated in the evidence provided. Without seeing where this information is communicated in the programme documentation, the visitors could not determine how a potential applicant would access the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme. During the same meeting with the programme team it was stated that the website would contain all the information required about the programme, however the website is currently under development and could therefore not be reviewed by the visitors. Without this information the visitors were unable to determine how the programme can meet this standard. The visitors therefore require evidence which demonstrates how the admissions procedures give applicants the information they require, including the requirements for competing the programme, to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

B.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate that there is an appropriate student complaints process in place.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the student handbook which outlined the process for academic appeals. The visitors did not consider this process to be a student complaints process as it did not allow a student to make a complaint or raise a concern about the programme. When meeting with the students, the students stated that they have never had to make a complaint about the programme but if they did they would know to approach the programme team in the first instance. The programme team confirmed this and clarified that there is a university wide complaints process, which is outlined to students during the indication process. However, without reviewing a copy of the complaints process for this programme the visitors cannot make a judgement on this standard being met. In addition to this, without seeing where the complaints process is communicated in the programme documentation the visitors cannot see how all current and future students would have access to the complaints process. The visitors therefore require documentation which demonstrates a clear complaints process for the programme and how this is communicated to students.

Recommendations

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the education provider considers developing the involvement of service users and carers from a physiotherapist and podiatrist background.

Reason: In meeting this standard the visitors met with a representative from the Patient Engagement in Nursing (PEN) group who discussed their involvement in the design and development of the programme. The visitors were satisfied with this involvement in the programme and that the standards is met at a threshold level. However the visitors noted that the involvement came from a group with a specific focus on nursing, rather than a physiotherapist or podiatrist focus. As such the visitors recommend that the education provider considers further developing the involvement of service users and carers in the programme and to ensure that physiotherapist and podiatrist perspectives are incorporated in that service user involvement.

Nicola Carey
Alaster Rutherford

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Programme name	MNSW Adult Nursing and Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	26 – 27 April 2016

Contents

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 15 June 2016 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 7 July 2016. 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 June 2016. 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 7 July 2016.

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. The education provider validated the programme and the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes:
- MNSW Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Children's Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Mental Health Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- BSc (Hons) Adult Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time;
- BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time;
- BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time; and
- BSc (Hons) Mental Health Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time.

The education provider, the NMC 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. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the NMC, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England) Roseann Connolly (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
HCPC observer	Sonya Lam
Proposed student numbers	8 per cohort, 1 cohort per year, across this programme and the BSc (Hons) Adult Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award).
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2016
Chair	Tony Turjansky (Edge Hill University)
Secretary	Kathryn Griffiths (Edge Hill University)
Members of the joint panel	Dawne Bell (Internal panel member) Karen Boardman (Internal panel member) Tony Gilbert (External panel member) Emmanuel Idowu (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Arija Parker (External panel member) Jennifer Pennington (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Kay Mafuba (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Nick Medforth (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Gordon Mitchell (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Wendy Wesson (Nursing and Midwifery Council)

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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the already running BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work and BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work 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 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five 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 provide evidence to demonstrate that appropriate information will be communicated to applicants prior to applying, including information regarding programme fees.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the University Validation Document (UVD) which outlines the information that will be made available to applicants. However, the visitors were unable to locate any information regarding programme fees. The visitors note that information regarding programme fees is crucial to ensuring that applicants have the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme. In addition to this the visitors noted that the UVD was not a document that would be made available to applicants and were therefore unable to see where applicants will be able to access relevant information prior to applying to this programme. The programme team stated that relevant information would be made available on the programme's web page, however the visitors were not provided with any evidence to support this. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that applicants will be given all the necessary information to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme, prior to applying. The visitors also require evidence to demonstrate how this information will be effectively communicated to potential applicants.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that practice placement providers are committed to delivering placements for this programme. Therefore the visitors cannot be certain this programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed to ensure commitment from all practice placement providers.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme is effectively managed

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this, one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the

placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that this programme is effectively managed. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

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 provide evidence to demonstrate that the processes to gain student consent prior to participating in role play activities are appropriately and consistently applied.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could see that the programme has a consent form in place to take student's consent prior to role play activities. The visitors were satisfied that the content of the consent form was appropriate. However, in a meeting with students it was stated that they were unaware of a consent form and had not signed one prior to participating in role play activities. Students stated that they gave informal, verbal consent. Although the students were not from this programme specifically the visitors note that without evidence that the consent form is being used on other programmes they cannot be certain that the processes attached to gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied to this programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that the processes around gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied for this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this, one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that the number, duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

Roseann Connolly
Gary Hickman
Sheila Skelton

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Programme name	MNSW Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	26 – 27 April 2016

Contents

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 15 June 2016 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 7 July 2016. 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 June 2016. 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 7 July 2016.

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. The education provider validated the programme and the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes:
- MNSW Adult Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Children's Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Mental Health Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- BSc (Hons) Adult Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time;
- BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time;
- BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time; and
- BSc (Hons) Mental Health Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time.

The education provider, the NMC 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. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the NMC, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England) Roseann Connolly (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
HCPC observer	Sonya Lam
Proposed student numbers	8 per cohort, 1 cohort per year, across this programme and the BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award)
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2016
Chair	Tony Turjansky (Edge Hill University)
Secretary	Kathryn Griffiths (Edge Hill University)
Members of the joint panel	Dawne Bell (Internal panel member) Karen Boardman (Internal panel member) Tony Gilbert (External panel member) Emmanuel Idowu (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Arija Parker (External panel member) Jennifer Pennington (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Kay Mafuba (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Nick Medforth (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Gordon Mitchell (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Wendy Wesson (Nursing and Midwifery Council)

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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the already running BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work and BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work 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 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five 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 provide evidence to demonstrate that appropriate information will be communicated to applicants prior to applying, including information regarding programme fees.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the University Validation Document (UVD) which outlines the information that will be made available to applicants. However, the visitors were unable to locate any information regarding programme fees. The visitors note that information regarding programme fees is crucial to ensuring that applicants have the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme. In addition to this the visitors noted that the UVD was not a document that would be made available to applicants and were therefore unable to see where applicants will be able to access relevant information prior to applying to this programme. The programme team stated that relevant information would be made available on the programme's web page, however the visitors were not provided with any evidence to support this. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that applicants will be given all the necessary information to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme, prior to applying. The visitors also require evidence to demonstrate how this information will be effectively communicated to potential applicants.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that practice placement providers are committed to delivering placements for this programme. Therefore the visitors cannot be certain this programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed to ensure commitment from all practice placement providers.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme is effectively managed

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the

placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that this programme is effectively managed. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

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 provide evidence to demonstrate that the processes to gain student consent prior to participating in role play activities are appropriately and consistently applied.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could see that the programme has a consent form in place to take student's consent prior to role play activities. The visitors were satisfied that the content of the consent form was appropriate. However, in a meeting with students it was stated that they were unaware of a consent form and had not signed one prior to participating in role play activities. Students stated that they gave informal, verbal consent. Although the students were not from this programme specifically the visitors note that without evidence that the consent form is being used on other programmes they cannot be certain that the processes attached to gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied to this programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that the processes around gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied for this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this, one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that the number, duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

<div align="right">

Roseann Connolly
Gary Hickman
Sheila Skelton

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Programme name	MNSW Children's Nursing and Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	26 – 27 April 2016

Contents

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 15 June 2016 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 7 July 2016. 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 June 2016. 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 7 July 2016.

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. The education provider validated the programme and the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes:
- MNSW Adult Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Mental Health Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- BSc (Hons) Adult Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time;
- BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time;
- BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time; and
- BSc (Hons) Mental Health Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time.

The education provider, the NMC 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. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the NMC, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England) Roseann Connolly (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
HCPC observer	Sonya Lam
Proposed student numbers	8 per cohort, 1 cohort per year, across this programme and the BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award)
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2016
Chair	Tony Turjansky (Edge Hill University)
Secretary	Kathryn Griffiths (Edge Hill University)
Members of the joint panel	Dawne Bell (Internal panel member) Karen Boardman (Internal panel member) Tony Gilbert (External panel member) Emmanuel Idowu (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Arija Parker (External panel member) Jennifer Pennington (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Kay Mafuba (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Nick Medforth (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Gordon Mitchell (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Wendy Wesson (Nursing and Midwifery Council)

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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the already running BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work and BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work 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 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five 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 provide evidence to demonstrate that appropriate information will be communicated to applicants prior to applying, including information regarding programme fees.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the University Validation Document (UVD) which outlines the information that will be made available to applicants. However, the visitors were unable to locate any information regarding programme fees. The visitors note that information regarding programme fees is crucial to ensuring that applicants have the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme. In addition to this the visitors noted that the UVD was not a document that would be made available to applicants and were therefore unable to see where applicants will be able to access relevant information prior to applying to this programme. The programme team stated that relevant information would be made available on the programme's web page, however the visitors were not provided with any evidence to support this. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that applicants will be given all the necessary information to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme, prior to applying. The visitors also require evidence to demonstrate how this information will be effectively communicated to potential applicants.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that practice placement providers are committed to delivering placements for this programme. Therefore the visitors cannot be certain this programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed to ensure commitment from all practice placement providers.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme is effectively managed

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the

placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that this programme is effectively managed. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

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 provide evidence to demonstrate that the processes to gain student consent prior to participating in role play activities are appropriately and consistently applied.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could see that the programme has a consent form in place to take student's consent prior to role play activities. The visitors were satisfied that the content of the consent form was appropriate. However, in a meeting with students it was stated that they were unaware of a consent form and had not signed one prior to participating in role play activities. Students stated that they gave informal, verbal consent. Although the students were not from this programme specifically the visitors note that without evidence that the consent form is being used on other programmes they cannot be certain that the processes attached to gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied to this programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that the processes around gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied for this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this, one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that the number, duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

<div align="right">

Roseann Connolly
Gary Hickman
Sheila Skelton

</div>

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Programme name	MNSW Mental Health Nursing and Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	26 – 27 April 2016

Contents

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 15 June 2016 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 7 July 2016. 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 June 2016. 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 7 July 2016.

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. The education provider validated the programme and the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes:
- MNSW Adult Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Children's Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- BSc (Hons) Adult Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time;
- BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time;
- BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time; and
- BSc (Hons) Mental Health Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time.

The education provider, the NMC 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. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the NMC, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England) Roseann Connolly (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
HCPC observer	Sonya Lam
Proposed student numbers	8 per cohort, 1 cohort per year, across this programme and the BSc (Hons) Mental Health Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award)
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2016
Chair	Tony Turjansky (Edge Hill University)
Secretary	Kathryn Griffiths (Edge Hill University)
Members of the joint panel	Dawne Bell (Internal panel member) Karen Boardman (Internal panel member) Tony Gilbert (External panel member) Emmanuel Idowu (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Arija Parker (External panel member) Jennifer Pennington (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Kay Mafuba (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Nick Medforth (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Gordon Mitchell (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Wendy Wesson (Nursing and Midwifery Council)

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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the already running BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work and BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work 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 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five 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 provide evidence to demonstrate that appropriate information will be communicated to applicants prior to applying, including information regarding programme fees.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the University Validation Document (UVD) which outlines the information that will be made available to applicants. However, the visitors were unable to locate any information regarding programme fees. The visitors note that information regarding programme fees is crucial to ensuring that applicants have the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme. In addition to this the visitors noted that the UVD was not a document that would be made available to applicants and were therefore unable to see where applicants will be able to access relevant information prior to applying to this programme. The programme team stated that relevant information would be made available on the programme's web page, however the visitors were not provided with any evidence to support this. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that applicants will be given all the necessary information to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme, prior to applying. The visitors also require evidence to demonstrate how this information will be effectively communicated to potential applicants.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that practice placement providers are committed to delivering placements for this programme. Therefore the visitors cannot be certain this programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed to ensure commitment from all practice placement providers.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme is effectively managed

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this, one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the

placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that this programme is effectively managed. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

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 provide evidence to demonstrate that the processes to gain student consent prior to participating in role play activities are appropriately and consistently applied.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could see that the programme has a consent form in place to take student's consent prior to role play activities. The visitors were satisfied that the content of the consent form was appropriate. However, in a meeting with students it was stated that they were unaware of a consent form and had not signed one prior to participating in role play activities. Students stated that they gave informal, verbal consent. Although the students were not from this programme specifically the visitors note that without evidence that the consent form is being used on other programmes they cannot be certain that the processes attached to gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied to this programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that the processes around gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied for this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that the number, duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

Roseann Connolly
Gary Hickman
Sheila Skelton

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	26 – 27 April 2016

Contents

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 15 June 2016 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 7 July 2016. 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 June 2016. 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 7 July 2016.

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. The education provider validated the programme and the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes:
- MNSW Adult Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Children's Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Mental Health Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- BSc (Hons) Adult Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time;
- BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time; and
- BSc (Hons) Mental Health Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time.

The education provider, the NMC 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. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the NMC, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England) Roseann Connolly (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
HCPC observer	Sonya Lam
Proposed student numbers	8 per cohort, 1 cohort per year, across this programme and the MNSW Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2016
Chair	Tony Turjansky (Edge Hill University)
Secretary	Kathryn Griffiths (Edge Hill University)
Members of the joint panel	Dawne Bell (Internal panel member) Karen Boardman (Internal panel member) Tony Gilbert (External panel member) Emmanuel Idowu (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Arija Parker (External panel member) Jennifer Pennington (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Kay Mafuba (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Nick Medforth (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Gordon Mitchell (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Wendy Wesson (Nursing and Midwifery Council)

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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the already running BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work and BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work 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 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five 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 provide evidence to demonstrate that appropriate information will be communicated to applicants prior to applying, including information regarding programme fees.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the University Validation Document (UVD) which outlines the information that will be made available to applicants. However, the visitors were unable to locate any information regarding programme fees. The visitors note that information regarding programme fees is crucial to ensuring that applicants have the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme. In addition to this the visitors noted that the UVD was not a document that would be made available to applicants and were therefore unable to see where applicants will be able to access relevant information prior to applying to this programme. The programme team stated that relevant information would be made available on the programme's web page, however the visitors were not provided with any evidence to support this. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that applicants will be given all necessary information to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme, prior to applying. The visitors also require evidence to demonstrate how this information will be effectively communicated to applicants.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that practice placement providers are committed to delivering placements for this programme. Therefore the visitors cannot be certain this programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed to ensure commitment from all practice placement providers.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme is effectively managed

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the

placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that this programme is effectively managed. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

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 provide evidence to demonstrate that the processes to gain student consent prior to participating in role play activities are appropriately and consistently applied.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could see that the programme has a consent form in place to take student's consent prior to role play activities. The visitors were satisfied that the content of the consent form was appropriate. However, in a meeting with students it was stated that they were unaware of a consent form and had not signed one prior to participating in role play activities. Students stated that they gave informal, verbal consent. Although the students were not from this programme specifically the visitors note that without evidence that the consent form is being used on other programmes they cannot be certain that the processes attached to gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied to this programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that the processes around gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied for this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that the number, duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

Roseann Connolly
Gary Hickman
Sheila Skelton

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	26 – 27 April 2016

Contents

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 15 June 2016 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 7 July 2016. 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 June 2016. 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 7 July 2016.

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. The education provider validated the programme and the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes:
- MNSW Adult Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Children's Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Mental Health Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- BSc (Hons) Adult Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time;
- BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time; and
- BSc (Hons) Mental Health Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time.

The education provider, the NMC 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. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the NMC, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England) Roseann Connolly (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
HCPC observer	Sonya Lam
Proposed student numbers	8 per cohort, 1 cohort per year, across this programme and the MNSW Children's Nursing and Social Work
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2016
Chair	Tony Turjansky (Edge Hill University)
Secretary	Kathryn Griffiths (Edge Hill University)
Members of the joint panel	Dawne Bell (Internal panel member) Karen Boardman (Internal panel member) Tony Gilbert (External panel member) Emmanuel Idowu (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Arija Parker (External panel member) Jennifer Pennington (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Kay Mafuba (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Nick Medforth (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Gordon Mitchell (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Wendy Wesson (Nursing and Midwifery Council)

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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the already running BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work and BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work 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 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five 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 provide evidence to demonstrate that appropriate information will be communicated to applicants prior to applying, including information regarding programme fees.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the University Validation Document (UVD) which outlines the information that will be made available to applicants. However, the visitors were unable to locate any information regarding programme fees. The visitors note that information regarding programme fees is crucial to ensuring that applicants have the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme. In addition to this the visitors noted that the UVD was not a document that would be made available to applicants and were therefore unable to see where applicants will be able to access relevant information prior to applying to this programme. The programme team stated that relevant information would be made available on the programme's web page, however the visitors were not provided with any evidence to support this. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that applicants will be given all necessary information to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme, prior to applying. The visitors also require evidence to demonstrate how this information will be effectively communicated to applicants.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that practice placement providers are committed to delivering placements for this programme. Therefore the visitors cannot be certain this programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed to ensure commitment from all practice placement providers.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme is effectively managed

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the

placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that this programme is effectively managed. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

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 provide evidence to demonstrate that the processes to gain student consent prior to participating in role play activities are appropriately and consistently applied.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could see that the programme has a consent form in place to take student's consent prior to role play activities. The visitors were satisfied that the content of the consent form was appropriate. However, in a meeting with students it was stated that they were unaware of a consent form and had not signed one prior to participating in role play activities. Students stated that they gave informal, verbal consent. Although the students were not from this programme the visitors note that without evidence that the consent form is being used on other programmes they cannot be certain that the processes attached to gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied to this programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that the processes around gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied for this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that the number, duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

Roseann Connolly
Gary Hickman
Sheila Skelton

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Adult Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	26 – 27 April 2016

Contents

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 15 June 2016 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 7 July 2016. 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 June 2016. 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 7 July 2016.

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. The education provider validated the programme and the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes:
- MNSW Adult Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Children's Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Mental Health Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time;
- BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time; and
- BSc (Hons) Mental Health Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time.

The education provider, the NMC 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. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the NMC, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England) Roseann Connolly (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
HCPC observer	Sonya Lam
Proposed student numbers	8 per cohort, 1 cohort per year, across this programme and the MNSW Adult Nursing and Social Work
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2016
Chair	Tony Turjansky (Edge Hill University)
Secretary	Kathryn Griffiths (Edge Hill University)
Members of the joint panel	Dawne Bell (Internal panel member) Karen Boardman (Internal panel member) Tony Gilbert (External panel member) Emmanuel Idowu (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Arija Parker (External panel member) Jennifer Pennington (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Kay Mafuba (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Nick Medforth (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Gordon Mitchell (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Wendy Wesson (Nursing and Midwifery Council)

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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the already running BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work and BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work 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 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five 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 provide evidence to demonstrate that appropriate information will be communicated to applicants prior to applying, including information regarding programme fees.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the University Validation Document (UVD) which outlines the information that will be made available to applicants. However, the visitors were unable to locate any information regarding programme fees. The visitors note that information regarding programme fees is crucial to ensuring that applicants have the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme. In addition to this the visitors noted that the UVD was not a document that would be made available to applicants and were therefore unable to see where applicants will be able to access relevant information prior to applying to this programme. The programme team stated that relevant information would be made available on the programme's web page, however the visitors were not provided with any evidence to support this. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that applicants will be given all necessary information to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme, prior to applying. The visitors also require evidence to demonstrate how this information will be effectively communicated to applicants.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that practice placement providers are committed to delivering placements for this programme. Therefore the visitors cannot be certain this programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed to ensure commitment from all practice placement providers.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme is effectively managed

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the

placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that this programme is effectively managed. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

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 provide evidence to demonstrate that the processes to gain student consent prior to participating in role play activities are appropriately and consistently applied.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could see that the programme has a consent form in place to take student's consent prior to role play activities. The visitors were satisfied that the content of the consent form was appropriate. However, in a meeting with students it was stated that they were unaware of a consent form and had not signed one prior to participating in role play activities. Students stated that they gave informal, verbal consent. Although the students were not from this programme specifically the visitors note that without evidence that the consent form is being used on other programmes they cannot be certain that the processes attached to gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied to this programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that the processes around gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied for this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that the number, duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

Roseann Connolly
Gary Hickman
Sheila Skelton

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Mental Health Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	26 – 27 April 2016

Contents

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 15 June 2016 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 7 July 2016. 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 June 2016. 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 7 July 2016.

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. The education provider validated the programme and the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes:
- MNSW Adult Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Children's Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Mental Health Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- BSc (Hons) Adult Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time;
- BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time; and
- BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time.

The education provider, the NMC 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. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the NMC, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England) Roseann Connolly (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
HCPC observer	Sonya Lam
Proposed student numbers	8 per cohort, 1 cohort per year, across this programme and the MNSW Mental Health Nursing and Social Work
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2016
Chair	Tony Turjansky (Edge Hill University)
Secretary	Kathryn Griffiths (Edge Hill University)
Members of the joint panel	Dawne Bell (Internal panel member) Karen Boardman (Internal panel member) Tony Gilbert (External panel member) Emmanuel Idowu (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Arija Parker (External panel member) Jennifer Pennington (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Kay Mafuba (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Nick Medforth (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Gordon Mitchell (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Wendy Wesson (Nursing and Midwifery Council)

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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the already running BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work and BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work 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 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five 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 provide evidence to demonstrate that appropriate information will be communicated to applicants prior to applying, including information regarding programme fees.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the University Validation Document (UVD) which outlines the information that will be made available to applicants. However, the visitors were unable to locate any information regarding programme fees. The visitors note that information regarding programme fees is crucial to ensuring that applicants have the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme. In addition to this the visitors noted that the UVD was not a document that would be made available to applicants and were therefore unable to see where applicants will be able to access relevant information prior to applying to this programme. The programme team stated that relevant information would be made available on the programme's web page, however the visitors were not provided with any evidence to support this. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that applicants will be given all necessary information to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme, prior to applying. The visitors also require evidence to demonstrate how this information will be effectively communicated to applicants.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that practice placement providers are committed to delivering placements for this programme. Therefore the visitors cannot be certain this programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed to ensure commitment from all practice placement providers.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme is effectively managed

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the

placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that this programme is effectively managed. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

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 provide evidence to demonstrate that the processes to gain student consent prior to participating in role play activities are appropriately and consistently applied.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could see that the programme has a consent form in place to take student's consent prior to role play activities. The visitors were satisfied that the content of the consent form was appropriate. However, in a meeting with students it was stated that they were unaware of a consent form and had not signed one prior to participating in role play activities. Students stated that they gave informal, verbal consent. Although the students were not from this programme specifically the visitors note that without evidence that the consent form is being used on other programmes they cannot be certain that the processes attached to gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied to this programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that the processes around gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied for this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that the number, duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

Roseann Connolly
Gary Hickman
Sheila Skelton

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	The University of Northampton
Programme name	Supplementary and Independent Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
Date of visit	20 April 2016

Contents

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 a protected title 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.

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register, the HCPC also approve a small number of programmes for those already on the Register. The post-registration programmes we currently approve include supplementary prescribing programmes (for chiropodists / podiatrists, dietitians, radiographers and physiotherapists) and independent prescribing programmes (for chiropodists / podiatrists, physiotherapists, and therapeutic radiographers).

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 2016 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 7 July 2016. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 1 August 2016. 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 25 August 2016.

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 our standards for prescribing for education providers and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers and / or independent prescribers.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme. The education provider, 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 for prescribing. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Hirsch (Independent prescriber) Clare Bates (Lay visitor) Gemma Quinn (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	10 per cohort, 2 cohorts per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2016
Chair	Julie Jones (The University of Northampton)
Secretary	Vivien Houghton (The University of Northampton)
Members of the joint panel	Stephen Hemingway (External 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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the standards for prescribing for education providers	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the standards for prescribing for all prescribers and / or independent prescribers	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the Nurse and Midwife Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (V300) 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 assured that the programme meets all of our standards for prescribing for education providers and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers and / or independent prescribers.

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 34 of the standards have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 16 standards.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. Conditions are set when certain standards for prescribing 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 for prescribing has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

A.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 advertising material, to clearly state that this programme is only open to podiatrists and no other allied health professionals.

Reason: From a review of the evidence, it was not clear to the visitors who the potential students for this programme would be. Discussions with the senior team revealed that the programme is currently designed for podiatrists because the education provider has a school of podiatry which will support this programme. It was confirmed by the senior team that this programme would not be open to other allied health professionals because the education provider will not be able to support their profession specific skills at this stage. However, the documentation provided prior to the visit did not reflect this information. As such, the visitors require the programme team to revise the programme documentation, in particular, admissions material to clearly articulate that this programme is only open to chiropodists / podiatrists and no other allied health professionals.

A.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 to demonstrate how they ensure potential applicants are fully informed about the requirements around the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS).

Reason: From a review of the documentation prior to the visit, it was not clear to the visitors the requirements for Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks for this programme. In discussions with the programme team it was confirmed that applicants are expected have an up to date DBS, no older than two years as part of the entry requirements. Upon review of the programme admission materials provided, in particular conditional letter, the visitors could not see how potential applicants to the programme are made aware of the requirements for up to date DBS, no older than two years. The visitors consider this information to be essential in enabling potential applicants to make an informed decision regarding whether to apply to the programme. This includes whether applicants will have to pay for their own DBS check or whether the education provider covers all costs. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence demonstrating how they ensure potential applicants to the programme are fully informed about the required currency and any associated fee of criminal conviction checks as part of the admissions procedures.

A.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 for prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensures that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. The visitors were directed to information about the generic webpage which potential applicants would have access to, however the visitors noted that this webpage did not have any specific information about the programme. In discussions with the programme team at the visit, the visitors heard that the AP(E)L policy does not apply to this programme and students are expected to complete all elements of the programme. However, this statement was not reflected in the programme documentation and advertising material. As such the visitors were unclear about how the programme team would ensure that applicants to the programme are informed that all elements of the programme are compulsory. Therefore the visitors require further evidence about how applicants are provided with information about AP(E)L for this programme. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

A.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 demonstrate how they will ensure potential applicants and students are fully aware that they are not able to practice as a supplementary and / or independent prescriber until they have a successfully completed the programme and their registration has been annotated.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensures that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. In particular, the visitors were unable determine where in the programme documentation applicants and students are fully made aware that they are not able to practice as a supplementary and / or independent prescriber until they have a successfully completed the programme and their registration has been annotated. As such, the visitors require the programme to demonstrate how they will ensure potential applicants and students are fully aware that they are not able to practice as a supplementary and / or independent prescriber until they have a successfully completed the programme and their registration has been annotated.

B.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not discern how the education provider will ensure that the programme has, and will continue to have, a secure plan in the education provider's business plan. In scrutinising the evidence, the visitors noted that the Allied Health Professional (AHP) Independent and Supplementary Prescribing programme will be managed alongside the Nurse and Midwife Independent Supplementary Prescribing (V300) programme, however the business plan statement made no reference to the education provider's commitment to support this model of training. At the visit, the visitors met with the senior team and

learnt that the programme has, and will continue to have a secure place in the education provider's business plan. Discussions covered financial security of the programme and security for students if the programme was deemed no longer viable. However, because this was not documented, the visitors require further evidence to be satisfied that the programme can meet this standard. The visitors therefore require further evidence which documents the education providers' commitment to this programme and model of study through its secure place in the business plan of the institution.

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence on how the programme will be effectively managed alongside the Nurse and Midwife Independent & Supplementary Prescribing (V300) programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider currently runs an approved Nurse and Midwife Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (V300) programme. In discussions at the visit, the visitors heard that the Allied Health Professional (AHP) Independent and Supplementary Prescribing programme will be managed and run alongside the Nurse and Midwife Independent & Supplementary Prescribing (V300) programme. However, the visitors were unable to gain a clear understanding of the lines of responsibility and roles of everyone involved in delivering this programme. In addition, the visitors heard that programme leader for the AHP Independent and Supplementary Prescribing programme will not be involved in the day to day management of the programme and that this will be handled by another member of staff. From the information provided, they could not identify which staff members will be responsible for which aspects of the programme and whether these staff were contributing to the programme in a full time or part time capacity. Therefore, the visitors did not have the evidence they required to determine how the programme is being effectively managed. In order to determine if this standard is met the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme will be effectively managed. Including the structure for the day to day management of the programme, lines of responsibility and the management structure of the programme considering that the programme leader will not be involved in the day to day management of the programme

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate how Visiting Lecturers (VLs) involvement within the programme is managed effectively.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team and senior team, the visitors noted that VLs are integral to the delivery of the taught curriculum. In discussions with the senior team, the visitors were made aware of how VLs are selected and recruited on to the programme as well as how they will contribute to the programme. However, the visitors were unable to determine the exact number of VLs that will be used to contribute to this programme or the role and responsibilities of all the VLs involved. In addition, the visitors were unsure of the mechanisms in place to manage VLs and who holds the responsibility to ensure that VLs are prepared and supported effectively. As such, the visitors require the education provider to submit further evidence to demonstrate how VLs involvement within the programme is managed effectively.

B.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Condition: The education provider must revise the documentation to clearly articulate the feedback mechanisms in place for programme monitoring and evaluation.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine if there are regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place. The visitors discussed the monitoring and evaluation of several aspects of the programme with the programme team. However, these systems were not always clearly reflected in the programme documentation. From the documentation the visitors were unclear about several aspects of the feedback systems in place. In particular, how student feedback is considered by the programme team, how any changes initiated by this feedback are implemented, and how any changes to the programme following feedback are communicated to students. The visitors also noted from the discussions at the visit, that there are opportunities for feedback from students, practice placement educators and practice placement providers. The visitors were unclear how practice placement feedback is considered by the programme team, how any changes initiated by this feedback are implemented, and how any changes to the programme following feedback are communicated to placement providers. The visitors were therefore unable to determine this standard is met. The visitors require information which clearly articulates student feedback mechanisms and practice placement feedback mechanisms in place for programme monitoring and evaluation.

C.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how the learning outcomes of the programme allow students to meet the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers:

1.11 be able to recognise different types of medication error and respond appropriately.
1.12 understand antimicrobial resistance and the role of infection prevention and control.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were unable to determine where in the curriculum the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers. From the standards mapping document, the visitors were unable to determine how the above standards were being taught within the curriculum in such a way to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers. The visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence that demonstrates that the learning outcomes ensure all standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers, specifically 1.11 and 1.12 are addressed within the curriculum.

C.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately identified and addressed.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence on how they ensure profession-specific skills and knowledge of podiatrists are adequately identified and addressed.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not discern how the education provider will ensure that the required profession-specific skills and knowledge of podiatrists are adequately identified and addressed. In scrutinising the evidence, the visitors noted that the Allied Health Professional (AHP) Independent and Supplementary Prescribing programme will managed and run alongside the Nurse and Midwife Independent Supplementary Prescribing (V300) programme. However, the visitors were unable to gain a clear understanding of how the education provider will ensure that profession-specific skills and knowledge of podiatrists will be adequately identified and addressed within the programme. As such, the visitors require further evidence on how they ensure profession-specific skills and knowledge of podiatrists are adequately identified and addressed.

D.3 The practice placements must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate how they will ensure that practice placements provide a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and designated medical practitioners, the visitors were unable to find enough evidence to determine how this standard is met. As such they are unclear as to how the programme ensures, as part of their approval and monitoring process, that practice placements provide a safe and supportive environment, which also affects how the programme continues to meets other standards on practice placements. Practice placements should provide a safe and supportive environment for students and staff. The visitors therefore require evidence of how the education provider will ensure that practice placement provide a safe and supportive environment.

D.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all practice placements.

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate how they maintain a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: The visitors noted a number of different documents submitted by the education provider to demonstrate how the programme meets this standard. However, in considering the initial documentation submitted and discussions held at the visit, the visitors could not find any evidence of overarching policies, systems and procedures in place regarding the approval and monitoring of placements used by the programme. From discussions with the programme team, it was unclear how the education provider would maintain responsibility for the approval and monitoring of practice placements. The visitors could not determine the criteria used by the programme team to assess a placement and the overall process undertaken to approve it, as well as how activities such as the practice educator and student questionnaires feed into this. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the overarching policies, systems and procedures

in place regarding the approval and monitoring of placements, and how they are put into practice, to ensure this standard is met. In particular, the visitors require further evidence of the criteria used to approve practice placement providers and settings. The overall process for the approval and ongoing monitoring of placements, and how information gathered from placement providers at approval, or during a placement experience is considered and acted upon. Any such evidence should articulate what the process in place is and how this supports the review of the quality of a placement.

D.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in the practice placements.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure all placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff. In addition, the visitors from the discussions at the visit, were unable to determine the process in place for ensuring that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff at practice placements. Due to the evidence provided and the lack of clarity around the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at practice placement, the visitors were unclear how much responsibility the education provider has and would continue to have for ensuring that the placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgment about whether this standard is met. As such the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced and, where required, registered staff**.**

D.6 The designated medical practitioner must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure all designated medical practitioners have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise students.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures all designated medical practitioners have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise students. In addition, the visitors from the discussions at the visit, were unable to determine the process in place for ensuring that designated medical practitioner have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. Due to the evidence provided and the lack of clarity around the process for ensuring that designated medical practitioners have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience, the visitors were also unclear as to how much responsibility the education provider has and would continue to have for ensuring that all designated medical practitioners have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise students. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgment about whether this standard is met, and requires further evidence as to how the education provider ensures all designated medical practitioner have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise students.

D.7 The designated medical practitioner must undertake appropriate training.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that designated medical practitioners have undertaken the appropriate placement educator training.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures designated medical practitioners (DMPs) undertake the appropriate training. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there are training options offered to DMPs but due to the nature of their role they are unable to attend classroom based training. Therefore, the DMPs currently on the Nurse and Midwife Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (V300) programme have not engaged with the training offered by the education provider. From this information, the visitors were unclear how much responsibility the education provider has and would continue to have for ensuring that all DMPs have undertaken the appropriate placement educator training. In addition, the visitors were also unclear as to what the programme team considers appropriate DMPs training and the monitoring systems in place to check that DMPs have had appropriate training. DMPs should have relevant training to ensure that all students on placement have as consistent experience as practicably possible when trying to achieve the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require evidence of what the programme team considers appropriate DMPs training and how the monitoring mechanisms in place to check that DMPs meet this requirement. This is to ensure that the DMPs are appropriately trained and that the programme meet this standard.

D.8 The designated medical practitioner must be appropriately registered.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure designated medical practitioners are appropriately registered.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and designated medical practitioners (DMPs), the visitors were unable to find enough evidence to determine how this standard is met. As such they are unclear as to how the programme team checks that DMPs are appropriately registered, which also affects how the programme continues to meets other standards on practice placements. DMPs should be appropriately registered to ensure that all students on placement have as consistent experience as practicably possible when trying to achieve the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require evidence of how the education provider will ensure that DMPs are appropriately registered and the monitoring mechanisms in place to check that this is the case at practice placements.

D.9 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the designated medical practitioners.

Reason: From the documentation provided and in discussions with the programme team and designated medical practitioners (DMPs), the visitors were made aware that the service level agreements with DMPs were informal and based on the nature of their good relationships with the DMPs. The visitors discussed this with the programme team

and it was indicated that the programme team are in the process of developing a system to maintain regular and effective collaboration with DMPs. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine from the evidence and discussions how the education provider will ensure they have regular and effective collaboration with the DMPs and consequently how this standard is met. The visitors require further evidence to show this standard is met**.** This standard is linked to other standards on practice placement.

D.10 Students and designated medical practitioners must be fully prepared for the practice placement environment, which will include being given information about:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of the experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the professional standards which students must meet;**
- **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 information as to how the education provider ensures designated medical practitioners and students are fully prepared for placements.

Reason: The visitors could not determine from the documentary evidence provided how the programme team ensures that students, and designated medical practitioners (DMPs) are fully prepared for placement. In particular the visitors could not identify how DMPs were made aware of what individual students' ability and expected scope of practice would be before they were allocated to a placement setting. As such they could not identify how the programme team manages the expectations of both the students and DMPs to ensure that students gain the experience they require at each placement setting. At the student meeting, the visitors heard that students had a varied experience of the preparation placement meeting which impacted on student's feelings of preparedness. The visitors therefore require further evidence about the mechanisms in place, including the expected outcomes from a preparation meeting, which demonstrate how the education provider ensures students are fully prepared for placement. In particular this should demonstrate how DMPs are made aware of students' experience and expected scope of practice for each placement and how the expectation of both the students and DMPs at placement are managed to ensure that students get the experience they require to meet the relevant learning outcomes.

E.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that demonstrates that the assessment strategy and design ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the following standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers:

1.11 be able to recognise different types of medication error and respond appropriately.

1.12 understand antimicrobial resistance and the role of infection prevention and control.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were unable to determine where in the curriculum the assessment of the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the above standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers. From the standards mapping document, the visitors were unable to determine how the above standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers were being taught and assessed within the curriculum in such a way to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for prescribing for independent and / or supplementary prescribers. The visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence that demonstrates that the learning outcomes ensure all standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers, specifically 1.11 and 1.12 are assessed within the curriculum.

E.10 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 a relevant part of the HCPC Register.

Condition: The education provider must include a clear statement in the assessment regulations that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the 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 the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

B.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

Recommendation: The education provider should inform HCPC once they have moved to the new campus through the HCPC major change process.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the on-site facilities at the Park campus were effectively supporting students through the programme. As such they were content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors were informed at the visit that the education provider intends to move the whole university to new grounds in the near future. The visitors were presented with brief information on where the university will be relocating to, but were not provided with any information on the resources that will be available at the new location. The visitors want to remind the education provider that they would need to notify HCPC through the major change process once they move to the new location as this may affect how the programme continues to meet this standard. In this way the HCPC can ensure that resources continue to be effectively used to support students in all settings and that this standard continues to be met

B.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Condition: The visitors recommend that the programme team continue to monitor the learning resources available to students on the programme, to ensure that they continue to effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: From the tour of resources at the visit, the visitors were made aware of the variety and volume of resources available to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. They were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, once this programme is approved the number of students and staff that will require access to resources will increase. Therefore, the visitors would like to recommend that the programme team continue to monitor the learning resources available to students on the programme, to ensure that they continue to effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

<div align="right">

Christine Hirsch
Clare Bates
Gemma Quinn

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Swansea University
Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
Date of visit	5 May 2016

Contents

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 a protected title 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.

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register, the HCPC also approve a small number of programmes for those already on the Register. The post-registration programmes we currently approve include supplementary prescribing programmes (for chiropodists / podiatrists, dietitians, radiographers and physiotherapists) and independent prescribing programmes (for chiropodists / podiatrists, physiotherapists, and therapeutic radiographers).

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 June 2016 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 7 July 2016. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 11 July 2016. 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 25 August 2016.

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 for prescribing for education providers - 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 our standards for prescribing for education providers and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers and / or independent prescribers.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Simon Mudie (Lay visitor) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
HCPC observer	Rebecca Stent
Proposed student numbers	20 per cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2016
Chair	David Gethin (Swansea University)
Secretary	Jayne Walters (Swansea 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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the standards for prescribing for education providers	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the standards for prescribing for all prescribers and / or independent prescribers	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

HCPC met with students from the SHGM75 Non-Medical Prescribing programme and PGCert Non-Medical Prescribing, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of our standards for prescribing for education providers and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers and / or independent prescribers.

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

The visitors agreed that 45 of the standards have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 standards.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. Conditions are set when certain standards for prescribing 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 for prescribing has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

B.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all programme documentation is updated so that it is reflective of the HCPC's requirements.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted references to an HCPC requirement "that AHPs applying to undertake an independent prescribing programme must: Have at least 3 years relevant post-qualification experience in the clinical area in which they will be prescribing" (Application form, page one). However, the HCPC does not prescribe a number of years in service before applying for an independent and / or supplementary prescribing programme. Therefore all programme documentation must be reviewed to ensure that the requirements of the HCPC are accurately reflected.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers will be involved in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider did not provide evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers will be involved in the programme. As such, the visitors were unable to determine prior to the visit, the exact nature of service user and carer involvement in the programme. At the visit, the visitors were provided with supporting evidence of how service users and carers will be involved in the programme. In scrutinising the evidence, the visitors were unable to determine how service users and carers will be involved for this programme. In addition, from the discussions with the programme team it was clear that formal future plans to involve service users throughout the programme have yet to be finalised. As such the visitors were unable to determine, from the evidence provided, how service users and carers will be involved in the programme. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating how service users and carers will be involved in the programme going forward.

C.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how the learning outcomes of the programme allow students to meet the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers:

1.5   be able to make a prescribing decision based on a relevant physical examination, assessment and history taking.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were unable to determine where in the curriculum the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers. From the standards mapping document, the visitors were unable to determine how the above standard was

being taught within the curriculum in such a way to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers. The visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence that demonstrates that the learning outcomes ensure all standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers, specifically 1.5 is addressed within the curriculum.

C.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately identified and addressed.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence on how they ensure profession-specific skills and knowledge of Allied Health Professionals (AHPs) are adequately identified and addressed.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not discern how the education provider will ensure that the required profession-specific skills and knowledge of AHPs are adequately identified and addressed. In scrutinising the evidence, the visitors noted that the AHPs Independent and Supplementary Prescribing programme will be managed and run alongside the Nurse and Midwife Independent Supplementary Prescribing programme. However, the visitors were unable to gain a clear understanding of how the education provider will ensure that profession-specific skills and knowledge of AHPs will be adequately identified and addressed within the programme. As such, the visitors require further evidence on how they ensure profession-specific skills and knowledge of AHPs are adequately identified and addressed.

E.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that demonstrates that the assessment strategy and design ensures that those who successfully complete the programme has met the following standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers:

1.5   be able to make a prescribing decision based on a relevant physical examination, assessment and history taking.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were unable to determine where in the curriculum the assessment of the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme has met the above standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers. From the standards mapping document, the visitors were unable to determine how the above standard for independent and / or supplementary prescribers is being taught and assessed within the curriculum in such a way to ensure those who successfully complete the programme have met the standards for prescribing for independent and / or supplementary prescribers. The visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence that demonstrates that the learning outcomes ensure all standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers, specifically 1.5 is assessed within the curriculum.

Alaster Rutherford
Simon Mudie
Joanna Jackson

hpcp | health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Transfusion and Transplantation Science).
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	12 – 13 April 2016

Contents

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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 6 June 2016 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 7 July 2016. 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 13 June 2016. 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 7 July 2016.

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. 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	Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist) Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Simon Mudie (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
HCPC observer	Stephen Cohen
Proposed student numbers	10 per cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2016
Chair	James Longhurst (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Secretary	Catherine Dyer (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Members of the joint panel	Alan Wainwright (External Panel Member) Alison Geddis (External Panel Member) Neville Hall (External 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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the FdSc Healthcare 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 35 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 22 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 advertising material, to clearly state that this programme is only open to employees currently working in the NHS Blood and Transplant (BT) department.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, it was not clear to the visitors who the potential students for this programme would be. Discussions with the senior team revealed that the NHS BT would be the sole provider of potential students for this programme. It was confirmed by the senior team that this programme would not be open to anyone beside employees from NHS BT. However, the documentation provided prior to the visit did not reflect this information. As such, the visitors require the programme team to revise the programme documentation, in particular, admissions material to clearly articulate that students will only be recruited from the NHS BT.

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 ensure potential applicants of the programme are given a complete range of information in order to make an informed choice about the programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were provided with a website link which contained generic information on entry requirement for the university. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that admission information about the programme will be provided initially by NHS BT who screen the potential applicants and then further information will be provided to applicants by the education provider before the academic year commences. However, in scrutinising the evidence the visitors were unable to locate a complete range of information that will be provided to applicants by the education provider in order for them to make an informed choice. During discussions with the programme team the visitors highlighted the importance of providing full information about the programme to applicants in order for them to be able to make informed decision. This included information about:
- the application process requirements;
- the learning contract;
- the enhanced disclosure and barring service and medical clearance;
- the five weeks academic blocks; and
- the interview day.

The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the above information is communicated to potential applicants, to ensure that they are able to make an informed decision regarding whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the admissions procedures and programme documentation to clearly articulate the procedures for criminal convictions checks for the programme.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not discern how the education provider will ensure that the admissions procedures applies selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks. In scrutinising the evidence, the visitors noted that each application is approved by a member of the programme academic in liaison with NHS BT. However, from the evidence the visitors were unable to determine the process for managing Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks. At the visit, the visitors met with the programme team and learnt that the education provider has a process for managing DBS checks. Discussions covered who makes a final decision about an applicant if they have a positive DBS and how applicants declare any convictions. However, because this was not documented, the visitors require further evidence to be satisfied that the programme can meet this standard. The visitors therefore require further evidence which documents the education provider admission procedure for applying selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks. In addition to, how this information will be communicate to potential applicants. In this way, the visitors can be assured that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The programme team must revise the admission process and programme documentation to clearly articulate the procedures for managing occupational health requirements.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not discern how the education provider will ensure that the admissions procedures applies selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements. In scrutinising the evidence, the visitors noted that each application is approved by a member of the programme academic in liaison with NHS BT. However, from the evidence the visitors were unable to determine the process for managing occupational health requirements. At the visit, the visitors met with the programme team and learnt that the education provider has a procedure for managing occupational health requirements. Discussions covered the requirement for vaccinations and occupational health assessments. However, because this was not documented, the visitors require further evidence to be satisfied that the programme can meet this standard. The visitors therefore require further evidence which documents the education provider admission procedures for applying selectins and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements. In addition to, how this information will be communicate to potential applicants. In this way, the visitors can be assured that this standard is met.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has information regarding their AP(E)L policy outlined in their 'academic regulations and procedure', which is a generic university wide policy. However, the visitors were unable to locate any clear detailed information regarding AP(E)L within the information provided to applicants to this programme. Discussion with the programme team clarified the policy was not regularly used. The programme team spoke of the support they provided applicant through this process. However, there is little information about it in the admissions information in relation to this programme. In addition, the visitors were unclear as to how the programme applied the generic AP(E)L policy and how potential applicants were made aware of what constitutes as criteria for AP(E)L. The visitors were also unable determine how the programme team actively monitor the AP(E)L process against the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the admissions and programme documentation to explain the process in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not discern how the education provider will ensure that the programme has, and will continue to have, a secure plan in the education provider's business plan. In scrutinising evidence, the visitors noted that the majority of the programme will be delivered offsite, however the business plan statement made no reference to the education provider's commitment to support this model of training. At the visit, the visitors met with the senior team and learnt that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. Discussions covered financial security of the programme and security for students if the programme was deemed no longer viable. However, because this was not documented, the visitors require further evidence to be satisfied that the programme can meet this standard. The visitors therefore require further evidence which documents the education providers' commitment to this programme and model of study through its secure place in the business plan of the institution.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate areas of responsibility across all areas of the programme to demonstrate that the programme is effectively managed.

Reason: From the documentation the visitors were unable to gain a clear understanding of the lines of responsibility for the education provider and the staff at the training sites based in the partnership NHS BT departments. In discussions at the visit it was articulated that the education provider would have overall responsibility for the programme. When the visitors asked for clarification about the roles and responsibilities of the different people who will be delivering the programme offsite, they were provided with a power point and a discussions about the different roles and responsibilities. However, from the discussions the visitors were unable to determine the exact roles and responsibilities of staff contracted by the education provider to deliver the programme at the partner training centres. As such, and without evidence of who is accountable for the delivery of each aspect of the programme, the visitors were unable to identify how the programme will be effectively managed. The visitors were also

unable to tell how the delegation of responsibility to trainers at NHS BT staff would ensure that the education provider has the information it needs to maintain overall responsibility for every aspect of the programme. The visitors therefore need further evidence to determine what aspects of programme delivery are delegated to staff at partner organisations and how this is delegation will work to provide the education provider the information they require to effectively manage the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place for this programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not determine what regular monitoring and evaluation systems will be in place for this programme. During the visit, the visitors discussed the monitoring and evaluation of several aspects of the programme with the programme team and how feedback will be managed between the education provider and BT NHS practice educators. However from the evidence provided in the documentation and in the discussions the visitors were unclear about several aspects of the feedback systems. In particular, the visitors could not determine how student feedback will be considered by the programme team, how any changes initiated by this feedback will be implemented, and how any changes to the programme following feedback will be communicated to students. As such, the visitors require further evidence to clearly articulate the regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place for this programme, how these systems will be implemented and how they will be used to quality assure the delivery of this programme to ensure that this standard is met

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to show how they ensure continuing professional and research development for staff.

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine how the teaching staff maintained their research, teaching and professional development to enable them to deliver an effective programme. In a meeting with the programme team, the visitors heard that a number of staff engaged in various research projects and further education. However, from this meeting the visitors were not able to gain a full understanding of the current participation from staff in research and continued professional development. The visitors noted it is important for the programme curriculum to ensure the teaching staff are up to date academically and professionally. The visitors therefore require further information to evidence the current involvement of staff in professional and research development to show that they will continue to deliver the programme effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the process undertaken to ensure training sites have resources in place to support student learning in all settings.

Reason: From the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors understood that majority of the programme will be delivered either remotely via an online learning environment (OLE) or at the university for five weeks academic blocks. During discussions the visitors were made aware upon confirmation of approval from the HCPC the programme team intend to approve a training site at Filton with the possibility of also approving other training sites. In discussions with the programme team the visitors heard that the programme team would approve training sites to ensure that they have appropriate resources in place to support student learning before sending students to the sites. However, the visitors could not determine from the evidence provided how approval of training sites would be conducted and how the education provider would ensure that processes were in place to identify if students at certain training sites lacked access to any resources, such as equipment to support clinical study. The visitors were also unclear how these processes would ensure parity of access to resources for students across all placement areas, and what the team would do to address any issues about resource access should they arise. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensures that all students have access to the resources they require in order to successfully complete the programme. They also require further detail of the approval process in place that will enable the programme team to ensure that students across training sites have resources in place to support student learning in all settings. In addition, the visitor require confirmation of the number of training sites the education provider intends to approve for this programme.

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 information about how they ensure that the resources including IT facilities across training sites are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students and staff.

Reason: From the evidence provided the visitors were aware of the learning resources including IT facilities that are being offered by the education provider such as an online library and an academic skills community. However, the majority of this programme will be delivered either remotely via an online learning environment (OLE) or at the university for five weeks academic blocks. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed that the programme team would approve training site centres to ensure that that they have appropriate resources including IT facilities. However, the visitors could not determine how approval of training sites would be conducted and how the education provider would ensure that processes were in place to ensure that resources across all training site centres are appropriate to the curriculum and readily available to student and staff. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence as to how the approval process conducted by the programme team ensures that there are sufficient resources including IT facilities across all training site centres. The visitors also require evidence to demonstrate how the programme team will ensure that the resources are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students and staff across all training site centres. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used and how the programme may meet this standard.

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 mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted the comment made by the education provider in the mapping document, "risk assessments are in place for all student practical". The visitors noted through discussion with the students and the programme team that there were no recognised protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical sessions. The visitors were concerned that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved with students participating as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about participation requirements within the programme, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained, or 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 protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers will continue to be involved in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine the exact nature of service users and carer involvement in the programme. The programme documentation suggested service users and carers will be involved in many aspects of the programme, such as admissions and programme delivery. Also, during discussions at the visit, it was indicated service users and carers may be involved in the interview process. However, from the discussions with the programme team it was clear that formal future plans to involve service users throughout the programme have yet to be finalised. At the visit, the programme team indicated that there are plans for their further involvement in the programme, but provided limited details about how the involvement will work. The visitors were unable to determine from the discussions or from the documentation provided that a plan is in place for how service users and carers will continue to be involved in the programme. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating the plans for future service user and carer involvement and the training offered to support their involvement.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate how they maintain a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: The visitors noted a number of different documents submitted by the education provider to demonstrate how the programme meets this standard. However, in considering the initial documentation submitted and discussions held at the visit, the visitors could not find any evidence of overarching policies, systems and procedures in place regarding the approval and monitoring of placements used by the programme. From discussions with the programme team, it was unclear how the education provider would maintain responsibility for the approval and monitoring of practice placements if they rely on IBMS approved list of approved placements. The visitors could not determine the criteria used by the programme team to assess a placement and the overall process undertaken to approve it, as well as how activities such as the practice educator and student feedback will feed into this. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the overarching policies, systems and procedures in place regarding the approval and monitoring of placements, and how they are put into practice, to ensure this standard is met. In particular, the visitors require further evidence of the criteria used to approve placement providers and settings, the overall process for the approval and ongoing monitoring of placements, and how information gathered from placement providers at approval, or during a placement experience is considered and acted upon. Any such evidence should articulate what the process in place is and how this supports the review of the quality of a placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place within practice placements.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the procedures for approving and monitoring practice placement providers. The visitors reviewed this information but were unable to determine from this how the education provider ensures that practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to students. Discussions with the programme team indicated that there is a process in place to ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place, but the visitors were unsure what these processes were and how this process formed part of the auditing and approving of all placements. In order to determine how the programme continues to meet this standard the visitors require the education provider to provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place and how they intend to continue to monitor this.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure all placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at practice placement settings.

Reason: From the initial documentation, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement settings. In scrutinising evidence, such as the professional profile and discussions at the visit the visitors learnt that the NHS BT, hold a database of staff that can act as placement educators. The

visitors were told that the NHS BT would feedback to the education providers regarding how many number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff were at each practice placement setting. However, the visitors were not provided with any evidence of how this will be done or how the education provider would maintain responsibility for ensuring all placement settings have an adequate number of qualified and experience staff at practice placement settings across the partnership sites. The visitors could therefore not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. As such the visitors will require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme can meet this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise students.

Reason: From the initial documentation the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise a student. In scrutinising evidence, such as the professional profile and discussions at the visit the visitors learnt that the NHS BT, hold a database of staff that can act as placement educators due to their relevant knowledge, skills and experience. The visitors were told that the NHS BT would feedback to the education providers regarding practice educators relevant knowledge, skills and experience. However, the visitors were not provided with any evidence of how this will be done or how the education provider would maintain responsibility for ensuring all practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience across all the partnership sites. The visitors could therefore not determine how the education provider ensures that practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise a student. As such the visitors will require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme can meet this standard.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that practice placement educators have undertaken the appropriate placement educator training.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there are practice educators training options that are offered to practice educators including workshops. The visitors acknowledged that there are training opportunities and workshops provided by the education provider for practice placement educators but were unable to see how each individual placement educator's training is monitored, or how the requirements for training feeds into partnership agreements with the providers. The visitors were unclear about the steps taken by the education provider to ensure that suitably trained placement educators were in place for students across the NHS BT sites. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to clearly articulate the training requirements for placement

educators and the processes in place for ensuring these requirements are met and monitored in practice placement setting.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, or agree other arrangements with the HCPC.

Reason: During discussions at the visit, the visitors heard that a register of all practice placement educators will be held by the employer NHS BT and that this register will record the practice placement educators' registration status. However, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider would maintain responsibility for ensuring placement educators are appropriately registered if the registration of practice educators are held by the NHS BT. They were also unclear as to the role of the education provider in agreeing other arrangements should appropriately registered practice placement educators not be available at certain placement sites. To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence of the process in place in ensuring placement educators are appropriately registered and what arrangements will be put in place should registered placement educators not be available.

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 which demonstrates how the learning outcomes, methods of assessment and alignment of modules for placements are effectively communicated and understood by students and practice educators.

Reason: From the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors understood that students on this programme will be already employed by NHS BT and therefore their placement will be at their work place. In discussions at the visit, the visitors heard that there will be opportunities for the student to go to different NHS BT sites in order to gain a complete placement experience. However, from the documentation the visitors were unable to determine how students, practice placement providers and practice educators will be fully prepared for placements. In addition, the visitors could not find detail in the documentation to support placement experiences, specifically regarding the learning outcomes, methods of assessment and alignment of modules for placements and how this will be effectively communicated and understood by all parties. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the students and placement educators at placement settings are given sufficient information to understand the learning outcomes to be achieved, and are therefore fully prepared for placement settings.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information on the processes in place to ensure that assessments undertaken at training sites are objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Reason: From the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors understood that majority of the programme will be delivered either remotely via an online learning environment (OLE) or at the university for five weeks academic blocks. During discussions the visitors were made aware upon confirmation of approval from the HCPC the programme team intend to approve a training site at Filton with the possibility of approving other training sites. From the discussions, the visitors were unable to determine whether the practice educators at the training sites would carry out assessments on the students at these sites. From the discussions, the visitors were unable to determine how the measurement of student performance would be objective and ensure fitness to practice across the different sites. Parity in assessments is a vital part of ensuring that the measurement of student performance is objective and ensures fitness to practice. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the process in place in ensuring assessments undertaken at training sites are objective and ensure fitness to practise.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms used to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment at the Filton site or any other training site used for this programme.

Reason: From the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors understood that majority of the programme will be delivered either remotely via an online learning environment (OLE) or at the university for five weeks academic blocks. During discussions the visitors were made aware upon confirmation of approval from the HCPC the programme team intend to approve a training site at Filton with the possibility of approving other training sites. From the discussions, the visitors were unable to determine whether the practice educators at the training sites would carry out assessments on the students at these sites. From the discussions, the visitors were unable to determine the monitoring mechanisms in place to ensure that if practice educator carried out assessment, then the education provider will ensure that each site will follow the same assessment methods with the same level of scrutiny. The visitors noted that assurance of consistency across sites is vital to ensure appropriate standards in assessment. The visitors therefore require further information on the monitoring processes to be used by the education provider to show that effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

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 assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards.

This standard requires that the programme documentation clearly states that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register to avoid any confusion. The visitors could not determine from the documentation 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 programme documentation to be updated to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. This will provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is met.

Ian Davies
Pradeep Agrawal
Simon Mudie