Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of visit	29 - 30 March 2017

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 operating department practitioner must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 26 May 2017 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 12 June 2017. 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 2017. 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 6 July 2017.

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. 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. A separate report, produced by the education provider outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner) Ruth Baker (Practitioner psychologist) Christine Morgan (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Tamara Wasylec
Proposed student numbers	55 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	28 August 2017
Chair	Peter Crabtree (Anglia Ruskin University)
Secretary	Joanne Wood (Anglia Ruskin University)
Members of the joint panel	Pam Page (Internal Panel Member) Alan Mount (External Panel Member) Luke McAndrew (Student 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)	☒	☐	☐

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 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

2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and / or professional entry standards.

Condition: The education provider is required to clarify the academic entry criteria, including the UCAS points required.

Reason: When reviewing the evidence the visitors noted a variation of the academic entry criteria. On pages 4 and 7 of the admissions and recruitment document that the number of UCAS points required for entry on to the programme is 80. However on page 44 of the Supplementary Information Form (SIF), it stated that 160 UCAS points are required. In discussion with the programme team it was confirmed that due to the new UCAS point tariff, the entry requirement for this programme is 80 UCAS points and that the information in the admissions and recruitment document was correct. Due to the variation of information in the documentary evidence, the visitors could not determine the academic entry criteria for entry onto the programme. Therefore further evidence is required to clarify the academic entry criteria for entry onto the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit programme documentation to ensure the language used is correct and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of terminology which is not accurate. For example, on pages 5, 7, 71, 128, 185 and 242 of the practice document it states that it is an HCPC requirement that students 'keep an ongoing record of achievement', however this is not an HCPC requirement. The visitors also noted that on the website, it is stated that 'As this is an NHS profession diploma, leading to registration with the Health and Care Professions Council… you'll need to be familiar with the NHS constitution and NHS values.' The visitors noted that familiarity with the NHS constitution or NHS values are not a requirement of HCPC and that this may not be clear from this statement. As such, the visitors require documentation to be revised to remove all instances of incorrect information and terminology and ensure it communicates accurate information on the resources available to students. This way the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available to support students' learning are being effectively used.

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 further evidence of the formal protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users on the programme.

Reason: In discussions with the programme team on the tour of resources, the visitors understood that students may, on rare occasions, participate as service users. When meeting with students the visitors heard that students were unclear about when they

may have participated as service users on the programme. As such the visitors could not see how students are made aware of the occasions where they may participate as a service user or how the education provider ensures that the students have an understanding of informed consent, including the right to withdraw consent. University and programme-specific student consent forms were tabled at the programme team meeting and the visitors understood that the forms will be given to students at the induction week of the programme. However the visitors could not see evidence of how the education provider ensures student understanding of the situations where their consent applies and therefore where they can withdraw. As such the visitors require information to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that the students are aware of the instances where they may participate as a service users and where their informed consent applies.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify the mandatory attendance requirements for the programme, how attendance is monitored, the consequences for not meeting the requirements and how this information is effectively communicated to students and staff.

Reason: In a review of Document one: course information, on page 42, the visitors noted that students are 'expected to attend all taught sessions for the modules' and attend practice 'averaging 24 to 32 hours per week'. The visitors also noted, on page 42, that there is a faculty attendance policy which is detailed in each individual module guide, however the visitors could not find this information in the module guides. In discussions with the programme team the visitors understood that a university wide policy on attendance does not exist however the programme uses its own policy on attendance. It was confirmed that the programme attendance policy requires attendance at all taught sessions for the modules and attendance at practice 'averaging 24 to 32 hours per week. In discussion with the students, the visitors understood that students were given the opportunity to 'make up' any hours they may have missed by attending extra placement hours and so they felt supported to complete this requirement. However the visitors could not determine whether 100 per cent attendance is mandatory across the programme and if so, how this is effectively monitored, or what the consequences for not meeting the requirement are, and how this is effectively communicated to students and staff. As such the visitors require evidence which clarifies the attendance requirement across the programme, associated monitoring mechanisms and how this is effectively communicated to students and staff.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to specify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme, including the number or retakes allowed and how this is communicated to students on the programme

Reason: The visitors considered the programme documentation however they could not identify how many times a student would be able to fail or complete any aspect of the programme and still progress throughout the programme. In their discussion with

students and practice placement educators the visitors noted that there were differing views regarding how many times a student may fail or repeat any aspect of the programme. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that following a failed attempt at any aspect of the programme the students would be allowed to retake the assessment, if a student fails the re-sit then they must take a re-sit with hours. This means that the student must attend the learning hours associated with that assessment, which the visitors understood to mean retaking the module. If a student where to fail the 're-sit with hours' they could then resit once more without hours. However, in discussion with the students, the visitors heard that students did not fully understand how it is possible to fail the programme. As such, the visitors could not identify, from the available evidence, how many times a student would be able to repeat any aspect of the programme before they are unable to continue on the programme or how this information is clearly communicated to students. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to specify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme, including the number of retakes allowed and how this is communicated to students on the programme. .

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider keep under review future service user involvement in this programme.

Reason: The visitors met a service user who was involved in the development of a previous programme and service users who will be involved in programme delivery from the start of the programme. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard was met at threshold level. From discussions with the service users and carers and the programme team, the visitors understood the plans to involve service users and carers in the programme, in a variety of ways, including the delivery of communication session; checking of programme documentation, attendance at two stakeholder meetings and two classroom visits whereby students will create action plans for scenarios presented to them by service users and carers. The visitors would encourage the education provider to document and implement these plans to involve service users so that their personal experience of care is directly used further in the programme and service user involvement and recruitment is kept under review.

Julie Weir
Ruth Baker
Christine Morgan

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme name	MSc Non-medical prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Independent prescribing
Date of visit	28 April 2017

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 **21 June 2017** 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 **12 June 2017**. 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 **5 July 2017**. 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 **24 August 2017**.

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 part of a joint event. The Nursing and Midwifery Council also considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – the PGCert Non-medical prescribing and the PGDip Non-medical prescribing. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of 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 for prescribing.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Prescription only medicines – administration) Christine Hirsch (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Niall Gooch
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort, 2 cohorts per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2017
Chair	Denise Prescott (University of Liverpool)
Secretary	Teri Harding (University of Liverpool)
Members of the joint panel	Eleri Mills (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 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 external examiners' reports prior to the visit. 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	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☐	☐	☒

The HCPC met with students from the Advanced Practice in Healthcare programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

The HCPC did not meet with placement providers and educators/mentors as the education provider did not arrange a meeting with them.

The HCPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the post-registration qualification does not require any specialist laboratories or teaching rooms.

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 40 of the standards have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining ten 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

C.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics on their prescribing practice.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that students will be prepared to reflect on how the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics affect their prescribing practice.

Reason: From their review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors were not able to see where in the curriculum students had an opportunity to reflect on how the applications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) may be different in their prescribing practice than in the rest of their work as an HCPC registrant. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed that students did have an opportunity to reflect on this as part of the teaching on the programme, but they were not able to see written evidence of where in the curriculum this took place. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit such evidence. In this way they can be confident that students completing the programme will understand how the HCPC SCPEs might affect them differently in their different roles.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how their process for auditing placements will ensure that placements provide a safe and supportive environment for students.

Reason: The visitors were able to discuss with the programme team how placements would be audited and how they would ensure that the designated medical practitioners (DMPs) were supervising students appropriately. The programme team stated that they were confident that all the DMPs connected with the programme were suitable for the role, for example they required that DMPs were registered with the General Medical Council. However, the visitors were not able to see written evidence of a formal procedure for ensuring a safe and supportive environment on placement, or any information about what the education provider considers as a 'safe and supportive' environment. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate that they have such a procedure in place, in order that they can be confident that students on placement have a safe and supportive environment.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that all designated medical practitioners who are supervising students have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: From review of the documents prior to the visit, the visitors were not able to see what procedures were in place for ensuring that all designated medical practitioners (DMPs) had relevant knowledge, skills and experience. In discussions with the programme team the visitors were told that DMPs tended to be experienced and qualified medical professionals who had appropriate experience of supervision and tuition of staff. However, the visitors were not provided with evidence that shows how

the education provider would ensure suitability of DMPs. The visitors therefore require that the education provider submit evidence showing how they collect information about the knowledge, skills and experience of DMPs, and how they decide whether such knowledge, skills and experience are appropriate.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that all designated medical practitioners who are supervising students have received appropriate training.

Reason: From review of the documents prior to the visit, the visitors were not able to see what procedures were in place for ensuring that all designated medical practitioners (DMPs) were appropriately trained to supervise and assess students. The documentation stated that all DMPs were invited to a training workshop at the start of the programme, and that those who could not attend were "given an opportunity" to discuss clinical supervision. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors explored what would happen if neither of these pathways proved practical in ensuring appropriate training for DMPs. The visitors were not clear how the education provider would ensure that all DMPs undertook training, what the content of that training would be, or by whom it would be delivered. The visitors note that the HCPC does not have specific requirements for the nature of this training, as long as the visitors are satisfied that it is appropriate (e.g. it need not be classroom-based or run by the education provider). Enabling and encouraging DMPs to undertake training was acknowledged to be difficult, given DMPs' professional commitments. However, it is a requirement of programme approval that DMPs are appropriately trained. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit evidence of how the appropriate training of DMPs will be ensured.

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 demonstrate how their assessments will ensure that the students are able to meet the following standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.

1.1 understand pharmacodynamics, pharmacokinetics, pharmacology and therapeutics relevant to prescribing practice.
1.2 understand the legal context relevant to supplementary and independent prescribing, including controlled drugs, mixing of medicines, off-label prescribing of medicines and the prescribing of unlicensed medicines.
1.3 understand the differences between prescribing mechanisms and supply / administration of medicines.
1.4 be able to distinguish between independent and supplementary prescribing mechanisms and how those different mechanisms affect prescribing decisions.
2.1 understand the process of clinical decision making as an independent prescriber.
2.2 be able to practise autonomously as an independent prescriber.

Reason: The visitors were able to look at the module descriptors, and discuss the content and arrangement of modules with the programme team. From the document review and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were not clear how certain parts of the student portfolio would be assessed, for the standards listed above. They therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing how the assessment in these areas will ensure that students meet the standards for prescribing.

E.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that all assessments are clearly and appropriately linked to the learning outcomes, and that the assessment methods used are appropriate.

Reason: From their review of the documentation, the visitors were not able to see how the marking criteria and assessment methods being used in the modules were linked to specific learning outcomes, especially in the objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs). The programme team gave verbal reassurances in discussions that assessment would be linked to learning outcomes, but the visitors considered that it was necessary for them to see written evidence of how this would be done, in order for them to be satisfied that the standard was met. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit evidence showing how each method of assessment used in the programme is linked to a particular learning outcome. In this way they can be confident that all students successfully completing the programme will have demonstrated the skills and knowledge needed to be safe and effective prescribers.

E.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure safe and effective prescribing practice.

Condition: The education provider must clarify how marking criteria are used in assessments, including in objective structured clinical examinations, to ensure safe and effective prescribing practice.

Reason: From review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were not clear about what marking criteria were being used on the programme. They also considered that more information was needed about what particular clinical skills would be assessed in the objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs) used on the programme. The documentation did contain a set of general marking guidance for Level 7 programmes, but the visitors were not clear how this general guidance would be applied to the various assessment methods on the programme. Without this information they were unable to be certain how the programme's measurement of student performance would ensure safe and effective prescribing practice. Therefore they require the education provider to submit evidence showing against which criteria student performance is judged in the various assessments.

E.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that assessment on placements is conducted to appropriate standards by those who have been appropriately prepared to do so, and how they will ensure that students' placement portfolios are assessed by programme staff.

Reason: In the programme documentation, the education provider stated that "the assessment of practice competence is delegated to suitably qualified practitioners in the workplace" (page 16). The visitors considered that, while designated medical practitioners (DMPs) were qualified to sign off students' practical skills if they were confident a student had mastered that skill, it was not generally appropriate for this assessment task to be delegated to staff who had not been trained as DMPs. The programme team did note that students' practical skills would also be assessed in objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs). The visitors did not consider that DMPs' signing off particular practical skills needed to be moderated by the programme team. However they did consider that students' overall practice portfolio ought to be assessed by the programme team and not the DMPs. The visitors were not clear from discussions with the programme team that this was planned, and were not able to see written evidence. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing how they will ensure that in the normal course of events it is DMPs who will be undertaking assessment of practice competence, and that students' practice portfolios will be assessed by the programme team.

E.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The education provider must clarify what pass marks are in place for the objective structured clinical examinations, and demonstrate how they determine that these pass marks are appropriate.

Reason: From their review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were not clear about what the pass marks were in some of the objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs). They considered that if it was not clear to students and staff how students could pass OSCEs, this might affect students' ability to progress and achieve within the programme. They also considered that if the pass marks were too low, this might enable students to progress on the programme without having fully demonstrated their ability to prescribe safely and effectively. They therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing what the pass marks for the OSCEs will be, and how the education provider determined the appropriateness of the pass marks. In this way the visitors will be able to be satisfied that there is clarity about the requirements for progression through the OSCEs, and that the requirements are appropriate.

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 provide evidence showing that a suitable external examiner will be in place as required.

Reason: From their review of the documentation, the visitors were not able to see evidence that the education provider had clearly specified requirements for the appointment of an external examiner for the programme. They were not able to be certain of what process or criteria would be used to make an appointment. The senior team stated in discussions that there were plans to make an appointment as soon as programme approval had been obtained. However, this standard needs to be met

before approval can be granted. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit documentary evidence clearly specifying how the appointment of an appropriately qualified and experienced external examiner would be made.

Recommendations

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Recommendation: The education provider should contact the HCPC in the event that they wish to expand the cohort size or admit more than two cohorts of 25 per year.

Reason: The programme documentation stated that the education provider were seeking approval for a maximum cohort size of 25 students, twice a year, and this was confirmed in discussions with the senior management team. However, the senior team also suggested during the meeting that in future they envisaged an expansion in student numbers, or a move to more than two cohorts per year, due to high demand in the region for non-medical prescribers. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that they should contact the HCPC well in advance of making such changes so that the HCPC can decide on the most appropriate process for approving them.

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Recommendation: The education provider should continue working towards greater involvement of allied health professionals in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were able to review the CVs of staff involved in the programme and their professional backgrounds, and discuss programme staffing with the programme team. The visitors noted that none of the programme team had a background in an HCPC-regulated health profession, and raised the issue of whether this would have any impact on the experience of students from such professions on the programme. The programme team stated that they were confident that they had enough depth of experience and expertise in prescribing to run an effective programme for all students. They noted that they were trying to identify appropriate people to support HCPC registrants on the programme, for example a physiotherapist who was on the university's Advanced Practitioner programme. They stated that they had considered using the established network of allied health professionals (AHPs) to provide professional support for HCPC registrants on the programme, even if the AHPs were not from prescribing professions. The visitors were satisfied that the standard was met overall, but they recommend that the programme team continue their efforts to increase input into the programme from HCPC-registered professionals.

B.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Recommendation: The education provider should ensure that students, especially from allied health professions, are aware of how to access support in balancing their programme commitments with other demands on their time.

Reason: In discussions with the student panel, the visitors were made aware that some students had not always been able to get released from their workplaces to attend learning and teaching activities. For example one student reported that she had not been able to attend some study days. This appeared to be an issue for students from allied health professions (AHPs) rather than for those from a nursing background, as there was not the same level of recognition for AHPs' desire to obtain post-registration qualifications. Although these students were from an Advanced Practitioner programme rather than the Non-medical prescribing (NMP) programme, the visitors considered that

the same issue might affect the NMP programmes. The visitors were satisfied that the student support arrangements for the NMP programmes met the standard, but in light of the above, they recommend that the programme team consider how they might support students with less supportive or less flexible employers.

C.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to consider how they ensure that the curriculum reflects best practice in non-medical prescribing for allied health professions.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme team have backgrounds in nursing rather than other health professions (see the Recommendation under B.6 above). They considered that this might affect their ability to ensure that the curriculum is appropriately updated for students from allied health professions (AHPs), who have some different needs from, and will be working in a different context to, nurse prescribers. From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the depth of expertise and experience meant that this standard was met overall, and that efforts were being made to obtain input into curriculum development from AHP academics and students. They recommend that these efforts should continue.

Paul Blakeman
Christine Hirsch

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme name	PGDip Non-medical prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Independent prescribing
Date of visit	28 April 2017

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 **21 June 2017** 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 **12 June 2017**. 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 **5 July 2017**. 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 **24 August 2017**.

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 part of a joint event. The Nursing and Midwifery Council also considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – the PGCert Non-medical prescribing and the MSc Non-medical prescribing. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of 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 for prescribing.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Prescription only medicines – administration)
	Christine Hirsch (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Niall Gooch
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort, 2 cohorts per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2017
Chair	Denise Prescott (University of Liverpool)
Secretary	Teri Harding (University of Liverpool)
Members of the joint panel	Eleri Mills (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 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 external examiners' reports prior to the visit. 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	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☐	☐	☒

The HCPC met with students from the Advanced Practice in Healthcare programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

The HCPC did not meet with placement providers and educators/mentors as the education provider did not arrange a meeting with them.

The HCPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the post-registration qualification does not require any specialist laboratories or teaching rooms.

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 40 of the standards have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining ten 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

C.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics on their prescribing practice.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that students will be prepared to reflect on how the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics affect their prescribing practice.

Reason: From their review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors were not able to see where in the curriculum students had an opportunity to reflect on how the applications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) may be different in their prescribing practice than in the rest of their work as an HCPC registrant. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed that students did have an opportunity to reflect on this as part of the teaching on the programme, but they were not able to see written evidence of where in the curriculum this took place. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit such evidence. In this way they can be confident that students completing the programme will understand how the HCPC SCPEs might affect them differently in their different roles.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how their process for auditing placements will ensure that placements provide a safe and supportive environment for students.

Reason: The visitors were able to discuss with the programme team how placements would be audited and how they would ensure that the designated medical practitioners (DMPs) were supervising students appropriately. The programme team stated that they were confident that all the DMPs connected with the programme were suitable for the role, for example they required that DMPs were registered with the General Medical Council. However, the visitors were not able to see written evidence of a formal procedure for ensuring a safe and supportive environment on placement, or any information about what the education provider considers as a 'safe and supportive' environment. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate that they have such a procedure in place, in order that they can be confident that students on placement have a safe and supportive environment.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that all designated medical practitioners who are supervising students have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: From review of the documents prior to the visit, the visitors were not able to see what procedures were in place for ensuring that all designated medical practitioners (DMPs) had relevant knowledge, skills and experience. In discussions with the programme team the visitors were told that DMPs tended to be experienced and qualified medical professionals who had appropriate experience of supervision and tuition of staff. However, the visitors were not provided with evidence that shows how

the education provider would ensure suitability of DMPs. The visitors therefore require that the education provider submit evidence showing how they collect information about the knowledge, skills and experience of DMPs, and how they decide whether such knowledge, skills and experience are appropriate.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that all designated medical practitioners who are supervising students have received appropriate training.

Reason: From review of the documents prior to the visit, the visitors were not able to see what procedures were in place for ensuring that all designated medical practitioners (DMPs) were appropriately trained to supervise and assess students. The documentation stated that all DMPs were invited to a training workshop at the start of the programme, and that those who could not attend were "given an opportunity" to discuss clinical supervision. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors explored what would happen if neither of these pathways proved practical in ensuring appropriate training for DMPs. The visitors were not clear how the education provider would ensure that all DMPs undertook training, what the content of that training would be, or by whom it would be delivered. The visitors note that the HCPC does not have specific requirements for the nature of this training, as long as the visitors are satisfied that it is appropriate (e.g. it need not be classroom-based or run by the education provider). Enabling and encouraging DMPs to undertake training was acknowledged to be difficult, given DMPs' professional commitments. However, it is a requirement of programme approval that DMPs are appropriately trained. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit evidence of how the appropriate training of DMPs will be ensured.

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 demonstrate how their assessments will ensure that the students are able to meet the following standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.

1.1 understand pharmacodynamics, pharmacokinetics, pharmacology and therapeutics relevant to prescribing practice.
1.2 understand the legal context relevant to supplementary and independent prescribing, including controlled drugs, mixing of medicines, off-label prescribing of medicines and the prescribing of unlicensed medicines.
1.3 understand the differences between prescribing mechanisms and supply / administration of medicines.
1.4 be able to distinguish between independent and supplementary prescribing mechanisms and how those different mechanisms affect prescribing decisions.
2.1 understand the process of clinical decision making as an independent prescriber.
2.2 be able to practise autonomously as an independent prescriber.

Reason: The visitors were able to look at the module descriptors, and discuss the content and arrangement of modules with the programme team. From the document review and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were not clear how certain parts of the student portfolio would be assessed, for the standards listed above. They therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing how the assessment in these areas will ensure that students meet the standards for prescribing.

E.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that all assessments are clearly and appropriately linked to the learning outcomes, and that the assessment methods used are appropriate.

Reason: From their review of the documentation, the visitors were not able to see how the marking criteria and assessment methods being used in the modules were linked to specific learning outcomes, especially in the objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs). The programme team gave verbal reassurances in discussions that assessment would be linked to learning outcomes, but the visitors considered that it was necessary for them to see written evidence of how this would be done, in order for them to be satisfied that the standard was met. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit evidence showing how each method of assessment used in the programme is linked to a particular learning outcome. In this way they can be confident that all students successfully completing the programme will have demonstrated the skills and knowledge needed to be safe and effective prescribers.

E.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure safe and effective prescribing practice.

Condition: The education provider must clarify how marking criteria are used in assessments, including in objective structured clinical examinations, to ensure safe and effective prescribing practice.

Reason: From review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were not clear about what marking criteria were being used on the programme. They also considered that more information was needed about what particular clinical skills would be assessed in the objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs) used on the programme. The documentation did contain a set of general marking guidance for Level 7 programmes, but the visitors were not clear how this general guidance would be applied to the various assessment methods on the programme. Without this information they were unable to be certain how the programme's measurement of student performance would ensure safe and effective prescribing practice. Therefore they require the education provider to submit evidence showing against which criteria student performance is judged in the various assessments.

E.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that assessment on placements is conducted to appropriate standards by those who have been appropriately prepared to do so, and how they will ensure that students' placement portfolios are assessed by programme staff.

Reason: In the programme documentation, the education provider stated that "the assessment of practice competence is delegated to suitably qualified practitioners in the workplace" (page 16). The visitors considered that, while designated medical practitioners (DMPs) were qualified to sign off students' practical skills if they were confident a student had mastered that skill, it was not generally appropriate for this assessment task to be delegated to staff who had not been trained as DMPs. The programme team did note that students' practical skills would also be assessed in objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs). The visitors did not consider that DMPs' signing off particular practical skills needed to be moderated by the programme team. However they did consider that students' overall practice portfolio ought to be assessed by the programme team and not the DMPs. The visitors were not clear from discussions with the programme team that this was planned, and were not able to see written evidence. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing how they will ensure that in the normal course of events it is DMPs who will be undertaking assessment of practice competence, and that students' practice portfolios will be assessed by the programme team.

E.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The education provider must clarify what pass marks are in place for the objective structured clinical examinations, and demonstrate how they determine that these pass marks are appropriate.

Reason: From their review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were not clear about what the pass marks were in some of the objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs). They considered that if it was not clear to students and staff how students could pass OSCEs, this might affect students' ability to progress and achieve within the programme. They also considered that if the pass marks were too low, this might enable students to progress on the programme without having fully demonstrated their ability to prescribe safely and effectively. They therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing what the pass marks for the OSCEs will be, and how the education provider determined the appropriateness of the pass marks. In this way the visitors will be able to be satisfied that there is clarity about the requirements for progression through the OSCEs, and that the requirements are appropriate.

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 provide evidence showing that a suitable external examiner will be in place as required.

Reason: From their review of the documentation, the visitors were not able to see evidence that the education provider had clearly specified requirements for the appointment of an external examiner for the programme. They were not able to be certain of what process or criteria would be used to make an appointment. The senior team stated in discussions that there were plans to make an appointment as soon as programme approval had been obtained. However, this standard needs to be met

before approval can be granted. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit documentary evidence clearly specifying how the appointment of an appropriately qualified and experienced external examiner would be made.

Recommendations

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Recommendation: The education provider should contact the HCPC in the event that they wish to expand the cohort size or admit more than two cohorts of 25 per year.

Reason: The programme documentation stated that the education provider were seeking approval for a maximum cohort size of 25 students, twice a year, and this was confirmed in discussions with the senior management team. However, the senior team also suggested during the meeting that in future they envisaged an expansion in student numbers, or a move to more than two cohorts per year, due to high demand in the region for non-medical prescribers. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that they should contact the HCPC well in advance of making such changes so that the HCPC can decide on the most appropriate process for approving them.

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Recommendation: The education provider should continue working towards greater involvement of allied health professionals in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were able to review the CVs of staff involved in the programme and their professional backgrounds, and discuss programme staffing with the programme team. The visitors noted that none of the programme team had a background in an HCPC-regulated health profession, and raised the issue of whether this would have any impact on the experience of students from such professions on the programme. The programme team stated that they were confident that they had enough depth of experience and expertise in prescribing to run an effective programme for all students. They noted that they were trying to identify appropriate people to support HCPC registrants on the programme, for example a physiotherapist who was on the university's Advanced Practitioner programme. They stated that they had considered using the established network of allied health professionals (AHPs) to provide professional support for HCPC registrants on the programme, even if the AHPs were not from prescribing professions. The visitors were satisfied that the standard was met overall, but they recommend that the programme team continue their efforts to increase input into the programme from HCPC-registered professionals.

B.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Recommendation: The education provider should ensure that students, especially from allied health professions, are aware of how to access support in balancing their programme commitments with other demands on their time.

Reason: In discussions with the student panel, the visitors were made aware that some students had not always been able to get released from their workplaces to attend learning and teaching activities. For example one student reported that she had not been able to attend some study days. This appeared to be an issue for students from allied health professions (AHPs) rather than for those from a nursing background, as there was not the same level of recognition for AHPs' desire to obtain post-registration qualifications. Although these students were from an Advanced Practitioner programme rather than the Non-medical prescribing (NMP) programme, the visitors considered that

the same issue might affect the NMP programmes. The visitors were satisfied that the student support arrangements for the NMP programmes met the standard, but in light of the above, they recommend that the programme team consider how they might support students with less supportive or less flexible employers.

C.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to consider how they ensure that the curriculum reflects best practice in non-medical prescribing for allied health professions.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme team have backgrounds in nursing rather than other health professions (see the Recommendation under B.6 above). They considered that this might affect their ability to ensure that the curriculum is appropriately updated for students from allied health professions (AHPs), who have some different needs from, and will be working in a different context to, nurse prescribers. From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the depth of expertise and experience meant that this standard was met overall, and that efforts were being made to obtain input into curriculum development from AHP academics and students. They recommend that these efforts should continue.

Paul Blakeman
Christine Hirsch

![hcpc health & care professions council]

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme name	PGCert Non-medical prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Independent prescribing
Date of visit	28 April 2017

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 **21 June 2017** 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 **12 June 2017**. 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 **5 July 2017**. 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 **24 August 2017**.

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 part of a joint event. The Nursing and Midwifery Council also considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – the MSc Non-medical prescribing and the PGDip Non-medical prescribing. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of 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 for prescribing.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Prescription only medicines – administration)
	Christine Hirsch (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Niall Gooch
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort, 2 cohorts per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2017
Chair	Denise Prescott (University of Liverpool)
Secretary	Teri Harding (University of Liverpool)
Members of the joint panel	Eleri Mills (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 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 external examiners' reports prior to the visit. 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	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☐	☐	☒

The HCPC met with students from the Advanced Practice in Healthcare programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

The HCPC did not meet with placement providers and educators/mentors as the education provider did not arrange a meeting with them.

The HCPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the post-registration qualification does not require any specialist laboratories or teaching rooms.

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 40 of the standards have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining ten 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

C.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics on their prescribing practice.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that students will be prepared to reflect on how the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics affect their prescribing practice.

Reason: From their review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors were not able to see where in the curriculum students had an opportunity to reflect on how the applications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) may be different in their prescribing practice than in the rest of their work as an HCPC registrant. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed that students did have an opportunity to reflect on this as part of the teaching on the programme, but they were not able to see written evidence of where in the curriculum this took place. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit such evidence. In this way they can be confident that students completing the programme will understand how the HCPC SCPEs might affect them differently in their different roles.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how their process for auditing placements will ensure that placements provide a safe and supportive environment for students.

Reason: The visitors were able to discuss with the programme team how placements would be audited and how they would ensure that the designated medical practitioners (DMPs) were supervising students appropriately. The programme team stated that they were confident that all the DMPs connected with the programme were suitable for the role, for example they required that DMPs were registered with the General Medical Council. However, the visitors were not able to see written evidence of a formal procedure for ensuring a safe and supportive environment on placement, or any information about what the education provider considers as a 'safe and supportive' environment. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate that they have such a procedure in place, in order that they can be confident that students on placement have a safe and supportive environment.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that all designated medical practitioners who are supervising students have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: From review of the documents prior to the visit, the visitors were not able to see what procedures were in place for ensuring that all designated medical practitioners (DMPs) had relevant knowledge, skills and experience. In discussions with the programme team the visitors were told that DMPs tended to be experienced and qualified medical professionals who had appropriate experience of supervision and

tuition of staff. However, the visitors were not provided with evidence that shows how the education provider would ensure suitability of DMPs.
The visitors therefore require that the education provider submit evidence showing how they collect information about the knowledge, skills and experience of DMPs, and how they decide whether such knowledge, skills and experience are appropriate.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that all designated medical practitioners who are supervising students have received appropriate training.

Reason: From review of the documents prior to the visit, the visitors were not able to see what procedures were in place for ensuring that all designated medical practitioners (DMPs) were appropriately trained to supervise and assess students. The documentation stated that all DMPs were invited to a training workshop at the start of the programme, and that those who could not attend were "given an opportunity" to discuss clinical supervision. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors explored what would happen if neither of these pathways proved practical in ensuring appropriate training for DMPs. The visitors were not clear how the education provider would ensure that all DMPs undertook training, what the content of that training would be, or by whom it would be delivered. The visitors note that the HCPC does not have specific requirements for the nature of this training, as long as the visitors are satisfied that it is appropriate (e.g. it need not be classroom-based or run by the education provider). Enabling and encouraging DMPs to undertake training was acknowledged to be difficult, given DMPs' professional commitments. However, it is a requirement of programme approval that DMPs are appropriately trained. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit evidence of how the appropriate training of DMPs will be ensured.

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 demonstrate how their assessments will ensure that the students are able to meet the following standards for independent and / or supplementary prescribers.

1.1 understand pharmacodynamics, pharmacokinetics, pharmacology and therapeutics relevant to prescribing practice.
1.2 understand the legal context relevant to supplementary and independent prescribing, including controlled drugs, mixing of medicines, off-label prescribing of medicines and the prescribing of unlicensed medicines.
1.3 understand the differences between prescribing mechanisms and supply / administration of medicines.
1.4 be able to distinguish between independent and supplementary prescribing mechanisms and how those different mechanisms affect prescribing decisions.
2.1 understand the process of clinical decision making as an independent prescriber.
2.2 be able to practise autonomously as an independent prescriber.

Reason: The visitors were able to look at the module descriptors, and discuss the content and arrangement of modules with the programme team. From the document review and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were not clear how certain parts of the student portfolio would be assessed, for the standards listed above. They therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing how the assessment in these areas will ensure that students meet the standards for prescribing.

E.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that all assessments are clearly and appropriately linked to the learning outcomes, and that the assessment methods used are appropriate.

Reason: From their review of the documentation, the visitors were not able to see how the marking criteria and assessment methods being used in the modules were linked to specific learning outcomes, especially in the objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs). The programme team gave verbal reassurances in discussions that assessment would be linked to learning outcomes, but the visitors considered that it was necessary for them to see written evidence of how this would be done, in order for them to be satisfied that the standard was met. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit evidence showing how each method of assessment used in the programme is linked to a particular learning outcome. In this way they can be confident that all students successfully completing the programme will have demonstrated the skills and knowledge needed to be safe and effective prescribers.

E.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure safe and effective prescribing practice.

Condition: The education provider must clarify how marking criteria are used in assessments, including in objective structured clinical examinations, to ensure safe and effective prescribing practice.

Reason: From review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were not clear about what marking criteria were being used on the programme. They also considered that more information was needed about what particular clinical skills would be assessed in the objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs) used on the programme. The documentation did contain a set of general marking guidance for Level 7 programmes, but the visitors were not clear how this general guidance would be applied to the various assessment methods on the programme. Without this information they were unable to be certain how the programme's measurement of student performance would ensure safe and effective prescribing practice. Therefore they require the education provider to submit evidence showing against which criteria student performance is judged in the various assessments.

E.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that assessment on placements is conducted to appropriate standards by those who have been appropriately prepared to do so, and how they will ensure that students' placement portfolios are assessed by programme staff.

Reason: In the programme documentation, the education provider stated that "the assessment of practice competence is delegated to suitably qualified practitioners in the workplace" (page 16). The visitors considered that, while designated medical practitioners (DMPs) were qualified to sign off students' practical skills if they were confident a student had mastered that skill, it was not generally appropriate for this assessment task to be delegated to staff who had not been trained as DMPs. The programme team did note that students' practical skills would also be assessed in objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs). The visitors did not consider that DMPs' signing off particular practical skills needed to be moderated by the programme team. However they did consider that students' overall practice portfolio ought to be assessed by the programme team and not the DMPs. The visitors were not clear from discussions with the programme team that this was planned, and were not able to see written evidence. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing how they will ensure that in the normal course of events it is DMPs who will be undertaking assessment of practice competence, and that students' practice portfolios will be assessed by the programme team.

E.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The education provider must clarify what pass marks are in place for the objective structured clinical examinations, and demonstrate how they determine that these pass marks are appropriate.

Reason: From their review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were not clear about what the pass marks were in some of the objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs). They considered that if it was not clear to students and staff how students could pass OSCEs, this might affect students' ability to progress and achieve within the programme. They also considered that if the pass marks were too low, this might enable students to progress on the programme without having fully demonstrated their ability to prescribe safely and effectively. They therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing what the pass marks for the OSCEs will be, and how the education provider determined the appropriateness of the pass marks. In this way the visitors will be able to be satisfied that there is clarity about the requirements for progression through the OSCEs, and that the requirements are appropriate.

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 provide evidence showing that a suitable external examiner will be in place as required.

Reason: From their review of the documentation, the visitors were not able to see evidence that the education provider had clearly specified requirements for the appointment of an external examiner for the programme. They were not able to be certain of what process or criteria would be used to make an appointment. The senior team stated in discussions that there were plans to make an appointment as soon as programme approval had been obtained. However, this standard needs to be met

before approval can be granted. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit documentary evidence clearly specifying how the appointment of an appropriately qualified and experienced external examiner would be made.

Recommendations

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Recommendation: The education provider should contact the HCPC in the event that they wish to expand the cohort size or admit more than two cohorts of 25 per year.

Reason: The programme documentation stated that the education provider were seeking approval for a maximum cohort size of 25 students, twice a year, and this was confirmed in discussions with the senior management team. However, the senior team also suggested during the meeting that in future they envisaged an expansion in student numbers, or a move to more than two cohorts per year, due to high demand in the region for non-medical prescribers. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that they should contact the HCPC well in advance of making such changes so that the HCPC can decide on the most appropriate process for approving them.

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Recommendation: The education provider should continue working towards greater involvement of allied health professionals in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were able to review the CVs of staff involved in the programme and their professional backgrounds, and discuss programme staffing with the programme team. The visitors noted that none of the programme team had a background in an HCPC-regulated health profession, and raised the issue of whether this would have any impact on the experience of students from such professions on the programme. The programme team stated that they were confident that they had enough depth of experience and expertise in prescribing to run an effective programme for all students. They noted that they were trying to identify appropriate people to support HCPC registrants on the programme, for example a physiotherapist who was on the university's Advanced Practitioner programme. They stated that they had considered using the established network of allied health professionals (AHPs) to provide professional support for HCPC registrants on the programme, even if the AHPs were not from prescribing professions. The visitors were satisfied that the standard was met overall, but they recommend that the programme team continue their efforts to increase input into the programme from HCPC-registered professionals.

B.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Recommendation: The education provider should ensure that students, especially from allied health professions, are aware of how to access support in balancing their programme commitments with other demands on their time.

Reason: In discussions with the student panel, the visitors were made aware that some students had not always been able to get released from their workplaces to attend learning and teaching activities. For example one student reported that she had not been able to attend some study days. This appeared to be an issue for students from allied health professions (AHPs) rather than for those from a nursing background, as there was not the same level of recognition for AHPs' desire to obtain post-registration qualifications. Although these students were from an Advanced Practitioner programme rather than the Non-medical prescribing (NMP) programme, the visitors considered that

the same issue might affect the NMP programmes. The visitors were satisfied that the student support arrangements for the NMP programmes met the standard, but in light of the above, they recommend that the programme team consider how they might support students with less supportive or less flexible employers.

C.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to consider how they ensure that the curriculum reflects best practice in non-medical prescribing for allied health professions.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme team have backgrounds in nursing rather than other health professions (see the Recommendation under B.6 above). They considered that this might affect their ability to ensure that the curriculum is appropriately updated for students from allied health professions (AHPs), who have some different needs from, and will be working in a different context to, nurse prescribers. From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the depth of expertise and experience meant that this standard was met overall, and that efforts were being made to obtain input into curriculum development from AHP academics and students. They recommend that these efforts should continue.

Paul Blakeman
Christine Hirsch

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	New College Durham
Validating body / Awarding body	The Open University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
	Prescription only medicines – administration (for chiropodists / podiatrists)
	Prescription only medicines – sale / supply (for chiropodists / podiatrists)
Date of visit	28 – 29 March 2017

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 'chiropodist' or 'podiatrist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until Wednesday 24 May to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 8 June 2017. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 1 June 2017. 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 6 July 2017.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The validating body considered the validation of the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – the Prescription Only Medicine Certificate and the Certificate in Local Anaesthesia.

The validating body, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with a chair supplied by the validating body and a secretary provided 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 validating body and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Andrew Hill (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Sheila Needham (Lay visitor) James Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Niall Gooch
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
First approved intake	September 2013
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	Sheila Counihan (Open University)
Secretary	Catherine Storey (New College Durham)
Members of the joint panel	Sheila Counihan (Open University) Craig Gwynne (Open University) Andrea Jones (Open University) Peter Roberts (Open University) Helen McCreeth (Open University) Alison Hart (College of Podiatry) Stuart Baird (College of Podiatry) Penny Renwick (College of Podiatry)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
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)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that their relationship with the new validating body will provide stability for the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation and from discussions at the visit that the programme's validating body would be changing from Teesside University to the Open University (OU). This is the third change of validating body for the education provider in the last ten years. The visitors considered that if there were to be further similar changes in the near future, this could create uncertainty about the future of the programme and so undermine its stability and viability. The visitors received verbal reassurances from representatives of the OU, who were in attendance to validate the programme, that the OU had a firm commitment to the programme for the foreseeable future, and the senior team reported that they wanted a long-term relationship with the OU. However, the visitors were not able to see a copy of a formal agreement or memorandum of understanding between the OU and New College Durham, concerning the OU's commitment to the programme. They therefore require evidence of such an agreement. In this way the visitors can be satisfied that the programme will continue to have a secure place in the NCD business plan.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that students have an opportunity during their clinical practice to integrate learning from the prescription-only medicine modules.

Reason: The visitors were able to have discussions with students and some staff at the placement setting, from which they did not see evidence that the students who had completed the prescription-only medicine certificates had an opportunity to observe the use of such medicines by qualified podiatrists with an annotation on the HCPC Register for prescription-only medicine (sale and supply). The visitors considered that this lack of opportunity to observe qualified tutors provide such medications might impair the students' ability, on completion of the programme, to meet the standards of proficiency for Chiropodists / Podiatrists. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that students have such opportunities. In this way the visitors can be satisfied that students' clinical practice is informed by the most relevant knowledge about use of medicines.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that, across the programme modules, assessments are clearly aligned to learning outcomes.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were able to look at the module descriptors in the programme documentation. However, in the descriptor for the elective module, they were not able to see learning outcomes against which students could be able to measure their work, and so could not be certain that all learning outcomes were being appropriately measured. In discussions with students, one student with dyslexia reported that they had found the mapping of learning outcomes hard to understand. The

visitors therefore require the education provider to ensure that for each module, the assessments are clearly aligned to the programme learning outcomes. In this way the visitors will be able to be satisfied that all students who pass each module are meeting the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must amend programme documentation to make a clear statement to students that attaining 360 credits and the BSc (Hons) will lead to eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the programme documentation there were a number of statements explaining that step-off qualifications on the programme would not lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration. However, they did not see evidence that students were informed that successful completion of the BSc (Hons) would lead to eligibility to apply for registration. They considered that this might lead students to being unsure of how exactly they could achieve and progress within the programme. Therefore they require the education provider to include in documentation a clear statement that attaining the BSc (Hons) provides eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC. In this way the visitors can be satisfied that students will have a clear idea of what they need to attain to be eligible to apply for HCPC registration.

Recommendations

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to monitor staff workload, and the balance between the staff's administrative, academic and teaching duties, to ensure that staff are able to continue to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team and senior management, the visitors were satisfied that the programme was effectively managed and that administrative support was in place. However, they considered that the programme team were operating near capacity and that if, for example, staff members left the department, then the ability of the remaining staff to deliver an effective programme might be impaired. They therefore suggest that the education provider closely monitor the pressures on staff time in order to avoid any impairment of the staff's ability to deliver an effective programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to develop service user and carer involvement by building on current service user involvement and integrating service user and carer feedback into curriculum development.

Reason: From discussions with service users and carers, the visitors were satisfied that the standard was met. A service users' forum has been created and there has been some service user involvement in the admissions process. All students have frequent interaction with service users and carers in clinical work throughout the programme, at the New College podiatry clinics at Bishop's Auckland and Framwellgate Moor, so the service users and carers are able to give some feedback to programme staff about student performance, achievement and attitude. However, the visitors did not see evidence of formal and systematic feedback about the programme from service users and carers to the programme team, or any means by which service user and carer feedback might be used in curriculum development. They therefore suggest that the education provider continue to develop their existing service user and carer involvement, including the service users' forum and service user involvement with admissions, and that they consider formalising feedback from service users and using that feedback for curriculum development.

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should continue its work to ensure that all students have access to scalpel work on placement.

Reason: From discussions with students, the visitors became aware that one placement provider – County Durham and Darlington NHS Trust (CD&DT) – had a policy in place preventing students on all levels of study from using scalpels while on placement. The visitors heard from the senior team that they were aware of this issue and had taken steps to ensure that all students had sufficient access to scalpel work to meet the standards of proficiency, i.e. giving students opportunities to do scalpel work in the podiatry clinics operated by New College at Bishop's Auckland and Framwellgate

Moor. The programme team also reported that they had been in negotiations with the Trust to have the policy changed, and suggested that progress was now more likely after personnel changes at the Trust. The visitors considered that while the CD&DT policy was potentially problematic, especially as students on the programme remain with the same Trust for all their placements across the three years, the standard was met. The programme team take steps to ensure access to scalpel work for the small number of students who cannot access it on placement. However, to ensure that the standard continues to be met, the visitors suggest to the programme team that they continue their efforts to ensure parity of access to scalpel work on placement.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider using feedback from practice placement providers in curriculum development.

Reason: From discussions with staff at placement locations, the visitors were satisfied that the standard was met. However, they did not see evidence of opportunities for regular or systematic feedback from placement providers and staff about the programme itself. They therefore suggest that the education provider develop opportunities for placement providers and staff to provide input into curriculum development.

<div align="right">

Andrew Hill
Sheila Needham
James Pickard

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	New College Durham
Validating body / Awarding body	Open University
Programme name	BA Hons Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social workers in England
Date of visit	5 – 6 April 2017

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 2 June 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 12 June. 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 16 June 2017. 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 6 July.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event as the validating body considered its validation of the programme. The visit also considered a BSc (Hons) Social Work programme that is delivered by the education provider validated by Teesside University. The validating body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. 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 validating body, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Mackay (Social worker in England) Richard Barker (Social worker in England) Frances Ashworth (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer	Tamara Wasylec
Proposed student numbers	Full time - 36 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2017
Chair	Mick McCormick (Open University)
Secretary	Helen McCreeth (New College Durham)
Members of the joint panel	Joan Fletcher (External Panel Member) Andrew Whittaker (External Panel Member) Kim Bown (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	☐	☐	☒

The HCPC did not review the external examiners' reports for the last two years as this programme is new and there is currently no external examiner. Instead the visitors considered the external examiners' reports for the BSc (Hons) Social Work programme at the education provider that is validated by Teesside University.

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
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 BSc (Hons) Social Work programme, validated by Teesside University, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 45 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 13 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure potential applicants to the programme are given a complete range of admissions information in order to make an informed choice about the programme.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the New College Durham website. The visitors understood that an 'offer of a place on the programme is subject to a satisfactory enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS)' check, however they could not determine what the process would be should an applicant declare a criminal conviction. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors understood that the team would discuss the applicant, consult the practice placement providers and that applicants would be considered on a case by case basis. However the visitors could not determine how this process is clearly communicated to potential applicants. In reviewing the website the visitors also noted that the UCAS point requirement is stated as 240 however the programme documentation states that applicants must achieve 90 UCAS points to be eligible to apply to the programme. Due to this discrepancy the visitors could not determine how potential applicants would ascertain the correct information regarding the UCAS point requirement. In reviewing the information provided, the visitors could not see how potential applicants are made aware of the new validator for the programme. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that information about the new validator will be added to the website following successful validation by the Open University. In review of the website the visitors noted that there was no reference to additional costs related to travelling to placements on the programme. As a result the visitors could not see how applicants are provided with the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme. Consequently, the visitors require evidence demonstrating how information regarding the DBS process, the UCAS point requirement, the new validating body and potential additional costs is communicated to applicants so that they have the information required to make a decision about whether to apply to the programme.

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 demonstrate the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning mechanisms applicable to the programme and how this information is made available to potential applicants.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were referred to the student regulations on the New College Durham website however they were unable to find the information regarding accreditation of prior learning on the website. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that the education provider has a policy on accreditation of prior learning. In discussion with the programme team, the team clarified that applicants would be able to use the accreditation of prior learning policy as evidence to meet learning outcomes on this programme. However, the visitors could not determine, from the evidence provided, where this is clearly articulated in the programme documentation to ensure that applicants could access this policy. The

visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme documentation will clearly articulate that the accreditation of prior learning policy of the education provider is applicable for applicants to this programme and how this information is made available to prospective applicants.

2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how equality and diversity policies are implemented and monitored through the admissions procedures.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were referred to the single equality scheme documentation however the visitors could not find this documentation in the submission provided. In discussion with the programme team the visitors heard that equality and diversity policies are applied once students are accepted on to the programme however the visitors could not determine how equality and diversity policies are applied in relation to applicants or how this is implemented and monitored through the admissions procedures. As such the visitors require information about how the admissions procedures ensure that equality and diversity policies are applied, monitored and implemented in relation to applicants.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the relevant guidance issued by HCPC. For example, the visitors were referred to a 'HCPC consent form', however the HCPC does not publish a consent form for use by students or education providers. The documentation also refers to HCPC accreditation rather than approval. The visitors identified other instances such as these throughout the documentation and noted that incorrect and inaccurate statements may mislead students and provide an incorrect impression of the HCPC as a statutory regulator. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for students. In this way the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available to support students' learning are being effectively used and that this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how they ensure the resources in place to support student learning in all settings are being effectively used.

Reason: In their reading of the documentation provided, the visitors noted that students would be able to access the learning resources of the education provider as well as that

of the validating body, the Open University (OU). The visitors were also made aware during the visit that the resources that the OU offers will be able to facilitate students completing the course in all settings as a number of resources available will be provided electronically. However, from the evidence provided, the visitors were unclear what support and guidance would be provided by the education provider to enable students on this programme to access and effectively use the resources of that were on offer from the OU. In particular the visitors were unclear as to how students will be supported in understanding what resources the OU will offer and how they will be supported to access relevant resources to effectively support their learning. Therefore the visitors require further evidence as to how the education provider will support students in understanding and accessing the OU resources that will be available to support their learning. In this way the visitors will be able to determine how this programme can meet this standard.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Condition: The education provider must provider further evidence of the complaints process that is in place for this programme, how this process takes account of any process at the validating body and how this is communicated to students.

Reason: From the evidence provided, both prior to the visit and in discussion with the programme team, the visitors were clear that the education provider has a complaints process for students. In further discussions at the visit, the visitors were made aware that the validating body, the OU, has a student complaints process and that students would be able to raise a complaint through this process. However, from the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how the complaints processes would work together. In particular they were unclear if, after a student raised a concern at the education provider and had it considered, they could then raise a concern at the validating body as well. They were also unsure as to how students were made aware of both complaints processes and informed about how the processes would work concurrently. Therefore the visitors require further evidence as to how the complaints process of the education provider will operate with the complaints process of the validating body. They also require further evidence as to how students will be made aware of both processes, are clearly informed as to how they should raise a concern and told about how a concern will be dealt with, if one is raised.

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 is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate the protocols in place whereby the education provider obtains consent from students for role play throughout the programme.

Reason: 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 in role-play sessions. The visitors were unclear as to how, 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

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

Condition: Further evidence must be provided of the education provider and validating body's processes that are in place for dealing with issues regarding students' professional conduct, how they will work in tandem and how students will be informed about them.

Reason: From the evidence provided, both prior to the visit and in discussion with the programme team, the visitors were clear that the education provider has a process for dealing with students' profession related conduct. In further discussions at the visit the visitors were made aware that the validating body, the OU, also has a process for dealing with any issues about students' profession related conduct and that issues about students' conduct could be addressed by the OU. However, from the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how the processes for dealing with any issues about students' conduct would work together. In particular they were unclear if, after an issues about a student's conduct was dealt with at the education provider, it could subsequently be raised with the validating body through their process. They were also unsure as to how students were made aware of both processes and informed about how the processes would work in tandem, and what the consequences could be for their progression. Therefore the visitors require further evidence as to how the process of the education provider will operate with the process of the validating body to appropriately, and consistently, deal with any issues that are raised about students' conduct. They also require further evidence as to how students will be made aware of both processes, are clearly informed as to how any issues will be dealt with and what consequences they could face if subject to these processes.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers.

Reason: In their reading of the documentation, the visitors noted the absence of the module specifications for the following modules; 'Relating Social Work Theory to practice 3', 'Placement 1' and 'Placement 2'. As such, the visitors could not determine what learning outcomes were associated with these modules. The module specifications for these modules were tabled at the visit, however there was insufficient time for the visitors to review the documentation. As such, the visitors could not determine whether the learning outcomes, associated with the modules on this programme, ensure that students have the opportunity to meet all of the standards of proficiency for social workers on completion of the programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to show the learning outcomes associated with this module and how they ensure that students who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for social workers.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensures those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers.

Reason: In their reading of the documentation, the visitors noted the absence of the module specifications containing the assessment strategy for the following modules; 'Relating Social Work Theory to practice 3', 'Placement 1' and 'Placement 2'. As such, the visitors could not determine how the associated learning outcomes for these modules are assessed. The module specifications for these modules were tabled at the visit, however there was insufficient time for the visitors to review the documentation. As such, the visitors could not determine the assessment strategy and design for the whole programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment strategy and design ensures that students who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for social workers.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how students are informed about points at which they will be able to exit the programme and whether they will be able to apply for registration with the HCPC.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors could not see any named awards that students could exit the programme with, if they failed to successfully complete certain elements of the programme. In discussion with the programme team, they clarified that there could be awards that students would be able to exit the programme with, but these were not currently named in the programme documentation. This standard requires that documentation relating to the programme clearly specifies requirements for student progression and achievement. The visitors therefore require further evidence of where within the documentation students are informed of all exit awards that relate to the programme and whether the exit awards lead to eligibility for students to apply for registration with the HCPC, to ensure that all options available for students are clearly communicated.

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

Condition: Further evidence must be provided which demonstrates that the programme documentation includes a statement which clearly states that any aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit made no explicit reference to an aegrotat award. However, in discussion at the visit they were made aware that any student who fails to compete the programme through ill health or other mitigating circumstances may be given an aegrotat award. The programme team stated students were informed that these awards did not confer eligibility to apply for

HCPC registration. However, the programme documentation did not contain a clear statement to this effect, which could lead to a misunderstanding about the status of these awards. The visitors therefore require the education provider to include a clear statement in the programme documentation that any aegrotat award would not confer eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

6.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for a procedure for the right of appeal for students.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the appeal procedure that is in place for this programme, how this process takes account of any procedure at the validating body and how this is communicated to students.

Reason: From the evidence provided, both prior to the visit and in discussion with the programme team, the visitors were clear that the education provider has an appeal procedure for students. In further discussions at the visit the visitors were made aware that the validating body, the OU, has an appeal procedure for students and that students would be able to appeal through this procedure. However, from the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how the appeals procedures would work together. In particular they were unclear if, after a student appealed at the education provider and had it considered, could they then raise appeal at the validating body as well. They were also unsure as to how students were made aware of both appeals procedures and informed about how the procedures would work in tandem. Therefore the visitors require further evidence as to how the appeal procedure of the education provider will operate with the appeal procedure of the validating body. They also require further evidence as to how students will be made aware of both procedures, are clearly informed as to how they are able to appeal and told about how any appeal will be dealt with, if one is made.

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

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

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. This standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme states that any external examiner appointed to the programme needs to be appropriately registered or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. Therefore the visitors require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiner to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that the programme can meet this standard..

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider how they will ensure profession-specific skills and knowledge will be adequately addressed if they plan to deliver 'inter-professional learning' (IPL) in the future

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors identified that the programme team is considering including other professions in the 'Mend the Gap' programme. As such, the programme team should consider that when they develop interprofessional learning that the profession-specific skills and knowledge of other professions must be addressed.

Anne Mackay
Richard Barker
Frances Ashworth

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of visit	20– 21 April 2017

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 'operating department practitioner' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 5 June 2017 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 6 July 2017. 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 21 June 2017. 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 24 August 2017.

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner) Diane Whitlock (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Proposed student numbers	10 per cohort, per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2017
Chair	Erica Joslyn (University of Suffolk)
Secretary	Alison McQuin (University of Suffolk)
Members of the joint panel	Mark Lyne (Internal Panel Member) Aida Rajic (Internal Panel Member) James Hollings (Internal Panel Member) Sarah Robinson (Internal Panel Member) Diane Last (External Panel Member) Andrew Gulley (External Panel Member) Lloyd Howell (College of Operating Department Practitioners)

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 Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice programme at the education provider, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it as it is not approved.

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.

A number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

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

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

The visitors 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 of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the admissions procedures clearly outlines to applicants what the health requirements are.

Reason: From a review of the website available to applicants, the visitors noted that the education provider state that, ''any offer of a place will be subject to a satisfactory health check''. In the validation document submitted by the education provider it clearly outlines what the health requirements are and what process applicants will need to go through to ensure that they have satisfactory health checks before being accepted onto the programme. However the information in the validation document is not available to applicants. The visitors were unclear on how the education provider clearly sets out the information regarding the health requirements for applicants. The education provider therefore needs to provide evidence which clearly outlines the health requirements for the programme and how this is made available to applicants.

2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they inform applicants and students about their equality and diversity policies and also how these policies are implemented and monitored.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the validation document. In this document there was a web link to evidence the education provider's equality and diversity policies. Upon reviewing the web link, the visitors were unable access the information that clearly articulated that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored, because it was password protected. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there was an equality and diversity policy in place in relation to applicants and students. However, the visitors were not clear how students and applicants are made aware of it, how this policy works, or how it is implemented and monitored. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the equality and diversity policies in place, together with an indication of how they are implemented and monitored and also how the education provider makes these policies available to applicants and students.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the documentation available to students to ensure that the resources in place to support student learning is effectively used.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the validation document that there were various resources to support student learning outlined, such as the buddy system. This information is not available in any of the documentation available to students, such as the student handbook. Therefore, the visitors were

unsure how students on the programme are made aware of all the resources available to them to support their learning. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the resources in place such as, the student handbook will be effectively used to support student learning in all settings.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that the learning resources for students are accurate to enable them to understand what standards of proficiency they need to meet.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that there were discrepancies between the Standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping document and the mapping of the SOPs students need to meet in all module descriptors. In the module descriptors the education provider has missed out some of the SOPs that need to be achieved in that module by the students. The visitors were satisfied that the learning outcomes of the overall programme will ensure that those who successfully complete the programme will meet the standards of proficiency for operating department practitioners. However, with the inaccuracy of the mapping in the module descriptors, the visitors were unsure how students would be made aware of what SOPs will be achieved in each module. The education provider therefore, needs to provide further evidence to demonstrate how students will be made aware of what SOPs they will need to achieve at each stage of the programme to ensure that resources to support student learning in all settings is effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that they have adequate resources to effectively support the teaching and learning activities of the programme.

Reason: At the visit the visitors were shown existing teaching facilities and the specialist resources within the simulation suite. The programme team told the visitors that they would want to increase simulation in the university setting. However, the visitors noted on the tour that there were insufficient resources for students to have a realistic simulated practice experience. During the tour the visitors noted that there was no operating table, patient positioning attachments and operating lights for example. Furthermore, during the meeting with the students they expressed that the equipment in the simulation suite was insufficient. The visitors were therefore unclear on how the education provider ensures that there are appropriate resources for simulations in the university setting.

Furthermore, at the visit the programme team, practice placement and the students told the visitors that students could access Ipswich hospital's facilities, when there are empty theatres on audit days. However, there are currently no formal arrangements in place. The visitors could therefore not determine whether all students have access to these facilities or just those undertaking their placement at Ipswich hospital, as well as when and how often students have access to these facilities. Furthermore, students are expected to use these facilities outside of the timetabled programme. The visitors noted that this could disadvantage some students who cannot access these facilities outside

of programmes timetable due to a variety of reasons and will therefore miss out on the opportunities to gain adequate simulated practice experiences.

Due to these reasons, the visitors cannot determine that there are adequate resources to support student learning, and teaching activities of the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that the physical resources in place to support student learning are appropriate to support the learning and teaching activities of the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider is required to clearly articulate what interprofessional learning there will be on the programme and how they will ensure that there will be operating department practice input into the learning.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the validation document which stated that the interprofessional learning strategy will be to introduce 'Human Factors within the Caring Perioperative Environment module'. However, the visitors could not see how Human factors within the caring perioperative environment module addressed interprofessional learning. Furthermore, in discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told that there would be 'other opportunities for interprofessional learning' and this will include an annual conference with a range of professions. This was however not reflected in the documentation submitted and the visitors were still unclear on what will be delivered at this annual conference. The visitors could therefore not determine how interprofessional learning will be delivered as part of this programme. The education provider is required to clearly articulate what interprofessional learning there will be on the programme, how they will ensure that there will be operating department practice input into the learning and how profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group will be adequately addressed.

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

Condition: The education must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the measurement of student performance at each academic level is objective and ensures fitness to practise.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the course handbook. The visitors were satisfied that the programme had objective grading criteria for the level 4 and level 5 academic year. However the visitors noted in the course handbook that the education provider had submitted the same grading criteria for level 4 and level 6. At the visit, the programme team told the visitors that this was a mistake and the level 6 grading criteria will be replaced. The education provider will therefore need to resubmit the level 6 grading criteria in order for the visitors to assess whether the measurement of student performance is objective for the appropriate level and ensures fitness to practise.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how best to communicate to student what would happen if they do not sign the role play consent form.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with programme team and students, the visitors were clear that students have to sign the role play consent form before students participate as service users. The programme team also told the visitors that if students did not want to sign the consent form they will not be penalised and there will be no consequences for not signing. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard was met. However, the students mentioned that they 'had not really thought about what could happen if they do not sign the form as they have always just signed it, and had no reason to decline consent'. The visitors would therefore like to recommend that the education provider considers clearly communicating to students that there will be no negative impact on their learning if they did not want to partake in practical sessions as service users.

Julie Weir
Tony Scripps
Diane Whitlock