Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	Diploma Higher Education Paramedic Studies
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	9 – 10 February 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 'paramedic' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 7 April 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 25 May 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 18 April 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 25 May 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 admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme. The visit also considered the BSc Paramedic Science. 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 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 BSc Paramedic Studies. 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 decision on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Ian Hughes (Lay visitor) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Niall Gooch
HCPC observer	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	55 per cohort, 3 cohorts per year
First approved intake	February 2016
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	Anne Devlin (Anglia Ruskin University)
Secretary	Joanne Wood (Anglia Ruskin University)
Members of the joint panel	Esther Norton (Internal panel member) John Talbot (University of Hertfordshire) Emily Gibney (Internal panel member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
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 the documentation does not exist, due to the programme only having run for a short period of time.

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 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

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

The visitors 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

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 that materials provided to prospective students make it clear that successful completion of the programme provides eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

Reason: This is a closed programme only accessible to staff from East of England Ambulance Service (EEAS) and London Ambulance Service (LAS). The visitors noted that a flyer produced for prospective students at EEAS and LAS tells students that they will be able to register and work as a paramedic as soon as they graduate. This is not the case, as individuals that successfully complete the programme must apply for, and be granted, registration by the HCPC before they can work as a paramedic. Therefore, the visitors considered that this statement is potentially misleading and must be altered to make it clear that successful completion of the programme only provides eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC rather than providing automatic ability to work as a paramedic.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how their monitoring processes ensure that all students have the opportunity to complete the required number of supernumerary placement hours and hours with a paramedic practice placement educator.

Reason: From the documentation and conversations at the approval visit, the currently approved programme has 1100 hours of practice placements in the ambulance setting.

Students on the DipHE continue to work shifts as ambulance technicians during their studies. Following discussions with the student panel, the visitors noted that many of the existing cohort were finding it hard to complete the required placement hours. Some students reported that, due to operational demand, it was common for students on placement to be reassigned away from shifts that they would be able to 'count' towards their placement hours onto shifts where they would be working as part of their normal duties. The students noted that they routinely found it necessary to work overtime, or forego annual leave until the end of the year, in order to accumulate the necessary placement hours. It was also mentioned that ambulances have on occasion been manned with one paramedic and two students.

The education provider is seeking to reduce placement hours to 750, partly as a response to pressure on students being able to complete the required number of placement hours noted above. Under the revised requirements students will need to complete a total of 300 supernumerary hours and 360 hours being supervised by a paramedic practice placement educator. The visitors were satisfied that this change was appropriate. However, the visitors considered that there was a risk that practice placement providers, facing operational pressures, could use the reduction in the

required hours for the students as an opportunity to increase the number of hours for which they are rostered in their day jobs as ambulance technicians, with the result that the pressure on students' required placement hours does not decrease. Therefore, they require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that students do not face difficulties in making up the necessary supernumerary and educator-supervised hours.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should ensure that a strategy is in place to ensure that student learning is not disrupted by further issues around effective use of space by the programme.

Reason: From discussions with the students, the visitors noted that there had been a recurring problem with teaching sessions being disrupted by non-availability of rooms and other resources (for example, training manikins), due to double-booking. Subsequent discussion with the programme team established that they were aware of the issue and were taking steps to address it. For example, the programme leader was making use of programme planning software to better organise resources. The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met, but recommend that the education provider continue their work to prevent the particular problems around booking of rooms and resources from persisting.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue their work to involve service users and carers in a broader range of activities on the programme, and to recruit a more diverse range of service users and carers.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that service users and carers were involved with the programme. However, they noted that their involvement is limited to objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs), where they act the part of patients. The visitors also noted that the service users and carers currently involved with the programmes come from only one organisation, and are not fully representative of the range of service users that paramedics may encounter in their practice. The visitors heard from the service users group co-ordinator that around 1,000 service users and carers were potentially available for involvement with programmes, and that there was a development plan to widen the involvement of service users and carers in both programmes. The visitors recommend that the education provider looks for ways to involve service users and carers in more parts of the programme, and that they seek to involve individuals from a more diverse range of backgrounds.

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 work towards making a broader range of out-of-ambulance placements available to students, with a particular focus on community settings such as GP clinics and minor injuries units.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the standard is met. However, they noted during discussions about placements that there was a very strong focus on ambulance placements. Given the changing nature of paramedic practice, the visitors recommend that the education provider should seek to provide a wider range of out-of-ambulance placements that reflect the kind of settings in which students are likely to find themselves during their professional careers. They noted that the education provider is

already working towards this goal with the planned development of a provider-wide health placement unit.

Glyn Harding
Ian Hughes
Penny Joyce

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	9 – 10 February 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 'paramedic' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 7 April 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 25 May 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 18 April 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 25 May 2017.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme. The visit also considered the DipHE Paramedic Studies. 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 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 DipHE Paramedic Studies. 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 decision on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Ian Hughes (Lay visitor) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Niall Gooch
HCPC observer	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	100 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
First approved intake	September 2014
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	Anne Devlin (Anglia Ruskin University)
Secretary	Joanne Wood (Anglia Ruskin University)
Members of the joint panel	Esther Norton (Internal panel member) John Talbot (University of Hertfordshire) Emily Gibney (Internal panel member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
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 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 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

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 that the programme website is clear that successful completion of the programme provides eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

Reason: The visitors noted that on the programme website, prospective students are informed that they will "be able to register and work as a paramedic as soon as you graduate." This is not the case, as individuals that successfully complete the programme must apply for, and be granted, registration by the HCPC before they can work as a paramedic. Therefore, the visitors considered that this statement is potentially misleading and must be altered to make it clear that successful completion of the programme only provides eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC rather than providing automatic ability to work as a paramedic.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all programme materials make it clear that students require an enhanced (rather than standard) Disclosure and Barring Service check.

Reason: The visitors noted that there was a disparity between the student handbook and the programme website regarding what kind of Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check is required before students can start the programme. The visitors noted that an enhanced DBS check is appropriate for this programme, but were not satisfied that this requirement was being communicated consistently to applicants, students and admissions staff across all programme materials. The visitors noted that the effectiveness and fairness of the admissions process could be affected, or that students might incur an unnecessary cost because they obtained the incorrect level of check. The visitors therefore require that the education provider updates all relevant programme materials to make it clear that an enhanced DBS is required before entry to the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that appropriate requirements for which vaccinations are needed before entry to the programme are consistently stated in the programme documentation, including who is responsible for obtaining and paying for vaccinations.

Reason: The visitors could not find references in the student handbook and on the programme website to what vaccinations are required before starting the programme, and who is responsible for accessing and paying for the vaccinations. They considered therefore that there was a risk that students would start the programmes without having had the appropriate vaccinations, or would have to make unexpected payments or

arrangements at the start of the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to update their documentation to ensure that it is consistent and clear, and to demonstrate that the vaccines which the students are required to have are the appropriate ones.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all students are fully prepared for placements, including information about all potential associated costs, timely notification of placement allocation, and receiving personal protective equipment.

Reason: During discussions with students, the visitors noted that there had been problems related to student preparedness for placements. Some students had:
- incurred unexpected travel costs;
- only been notified of placement locations very close to the start of the placement; or
- experienced delays obtaining personal protective equipment for their ambulance placements.

The visitors noted that these problems did not seem to have been experienced by most students, and the student panel reported that there had been some improvements following their feedback. Delays in obtaining personal protective equipment appeared to stem from a confusion about whether provision of such equipment was the responsibility of the placement provider or the education provider. The programme team stated that the education provider had agreed with placement providers that responsibility for providing personal protective equipment lay with placement providers. They also stated that there was a policy that students should receive notification of placement details seven weeks before the start of the placement, and certainly no later than three weeks beforehand. However, the visitors were unable to find references to these statements / policies in the programme documentation, and were therefore unclear how the education provider would ensure that they would be understood by all parties, and applied consistently. Therefore, the visitors require further information that demonstrates how the education provider will ensure that students are fully prepared for placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must amend all course and publicity materials to make it clear that students who do not pass practice placements will not be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC.

Reason: The education providers offers various awards at different exit points from the three-year BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science. The BSc (Hons) is the only qualification that offers eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC. In order to be awarded this qualification, the education provider noted that students must successfully complete all practice placements as well as achieving 360 credits in the academic modules. The placements are integrated into the programme as zero-credit modules. The visitors were satisfied that integrating practice placements in this way was an appropriate approach. However, there was no explicit statement in the programme materials that eligibility to apply for HCPC registration was dependent on successful completion of the practice placements as well as the 360 credits. Therefore the visitors require that this is made clear to students in all documentation associated with the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should ensure that a strategy is in place to ensure that student learning is not disrupted by further issues around effective use of space by the programme.

Reason: From discussions with the students, the visitors noted that there had been a recurring problem with teaching sessions being disrupted by non-availability of rooms and other resources (for example, training manikins), due to double-booking. Subsequent discussion with the programme team established that they were aware of the issue and were taking steps to address it. For example, the programme leader was making use of programme planning software to better organise resources. The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met, but recommend that the education provider continue their work to prevent the particular problems around booking of rooms and resources from persisting.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue their work to involve service users and carers in a broader range of activities on the programme, and to recruit a more diverse range of service users and carers.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that service users and carers were involved with the programme. However, they noted that their involvement is limited to objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs), where they act the part of patients. The visitors also noted that the service users and carers currently involved with the programmes come from only one organisation, and are not fully representative of the range of service users that paramedics may encounter in their practice. The visitors heard from the service users group co-ordinator that around 1,000 service users and carers were potentially available for involvement with programmes, and that there was a development plan to widen the involvement of service users and carers in both programmes. The visitors recommend that the education provider looks for ways to involve service users and carers in more parts of the programme, and that they seek to involve individuals from a more diverse range of backgrounds.

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 work towards making a broader range of out-of-ambulance placements available to students, with a particular focus on community settings such as GP clinics and minor injuries units.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the standard is met. However, they noted during discussions about placements that there was a very strong focus on ambulance placements. Given the changing nature of paramedic practice, the visitors recommend that the education provider should seek to provide a wider range of out-of-ambulance placements that reflect the kind of settings in which students are likely to find themselves during their professional careers. They noted that the education provider is

already working towards this goal with the planned development of a provider-wide health placement unit.

Glyn Harding
Ian Hughes
Penny Joyce

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Buckinghamshire New University
Programme name	Graduate Certificate Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
Date of visit	15 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 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 28 April 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 25 May 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 26 May 2016 The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 8 June 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 and independent prescribers.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the regulatory bodies considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a post graduate certificate in non-medical prescribing programme. The education provider, the regulatory bodies 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 for prescribing. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the regulatory bodies, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicholas Haddington (Independent prescriber) James Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Tamara Wasylec
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort, 2 cohorts per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2017
Chair	Phil Wood (Buckinghamshire New University)
Secretary	Shabana Hussain (Buckinghamshire New University)
Members of the joint panel	Elli Smith (Internal Panel Member) Lisa Ooi (Internal Panel Member) Ohio Orumen (Internal Panel Member) Jeanette Hocking (Internal Panel Member) Katherine Hardware (External Panel Member) Haifa Lyster (External Panel Member) Andy Husband (General Pharmaceutical Council) Chris Langley (General Pharmaceutical Council) Philippa Mc Simpson (General Pharmaceutical Council)

| | Brian Furman (General Pharmaceutical Council) |
| | Joanne Pike (Nursing & 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	☒	☐	☐

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 Independent and Supplementary nurse prescribing programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 43 of the standards have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining six standards.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to clearly articulate the information applicants require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme and where applicants can access this information, prior to applying.

Reason: To demonstrate how this standard is met the visitors were directed to the marketing material, programme specification and application form, however, the marketing material was not submitted as evidence. The programme team stated that the information would be made available to applicants prior to applying via the programme's web page, however, the visitors were not provided with any evidence to demonstrate how this would be presented to applicants and the information that would be included. The visitors note that without seeing how applicants can access the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on this programme prior to applying they cannot be certain that this standard is met. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors understood that applicants have the opportunity to study the programme at level 6 (Graduate certificate non-medical prescribing) or level 7, (Post graduate certificate non-medical prescribing). In discussion with the students, the students stated that they could not apply to the level 7 programme if they had not previously completed a level 6 qualification. However, in discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that the programme would consider students who have not studied at level 6 previously but had recent experience of studying at level 7. Due to the inconsistency in the information provided, the visitors could not see how the applicant is given the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the level of study required, the prerequisites for study on the programme and how this is clearly communicated to applicants, prior to applying.

A.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to the selection and entry criteria, including their policy on the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning for this programme, how it is applied and how this is communicated to applicants and students

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors understood that applicants have the opportunity to study the programme at level 6 or level 7. In discussion with the students, the students stated that an entry requirement for studying the level 7 programme is that students must have completed a level 6 qualification previously. However, in discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that the programme would consider students who have not studied at level 6 previously but had recent experience of studying at level 7. The programme team further explained that they would apply the university policy regarding AP(E)L. However, the visitors did not see evidence as to how the AP(E)L policy would be applied on the programme and how it would be appropriate to assess a student's ability to study the programme at level 7.

As such the visitors were unclear on the policy around APEL for this course and how it will be applied. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate their selection and entry criteria, including their policy on the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning for this programme, how it will be applied and how it will be communicated to applicants and students.

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

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

Reason: From a review of the context document on page 15 the visitors noted a reference to 'accreditation' by the HCPC. However, the HCPC approves programmes rather than accredits them. Additionally, on page 15 of the portfolio documents a clinical competency is repeated so both competency 10 and 11 are the same. The visitors therefore require the documentation to be revised to remove all instances of incorrect terminology and inaccurate information about the programme to ensure that the resources to support student learning in all settings are effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate that any significant changes made as a response to the internal validation event have been mitigated against, so the way the programme meets the standards for prescribing is not significantly impacted.

Reason: Through discussion at the visit, and from the final conclusions of the internal validation panel it was clear that revisions will be made to the assessment strategy to meet conditions set by the joint panel. The visitors considered the programme documentation provided prior to the visit. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors need to review any significant changes made due to the education provider's response to the internal validation event. To evidence that this condition is met, the education provider may wish to provide the programme documentation that has been revised, or provide an overview of their response to the internal validation event.

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 visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics on their prescribing practice.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors could not see where in the curriculum the students learn about the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) on their prescribing practice or how the education provider ensures student understanding. In discussions with the programme team, the staff assured the visitors that the SCPEs were embedded in the

learning and assessment on the programme. As such, the visitors require evidence to clarify where in the curriculum the students learn about the implications of the SCPEs on prescribing practice and by what means the education provider assess this learning.

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

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

Reason: From a review of the designated medical practitioners (DMP) handbook, the visitors noted, on page 2, that DMPs are responsible for monitoring a student's progress. On page 8 of the DMP handbook, it states that a DMP is required to meet with their student for an initial, intermediate and final interview to discuss their progress on placement. At the visit, the education provider stated that it is incumbent on the DMP to notify the education provider of any concerns they might have regarding a student's progress as a result of these meetings. From the documentation provided and in discussions with the programme team and designated medical practitioners (DMPs), the visitors were made aware that communication between the DMPs and education providers was informal and based on the nature of their good relationships with the DMPs. However the visitors could not see, from the evidence provided, the systems in place to maintain regular, formal and effective collaboration with DMPs. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine from the evidence and discussions how the education provider will ensure they have regular and effective collaboration with the DMPs, particularly in relation to how a student's progress is monitored, and consequently how this standard is met. The visitors require further evidence to show this standard is met. This standard is linked to the following standard on practice placement.

D.10 Students and designated medical practitioners must be fully prepared for the practice placement environment, which will include being given information about:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of the experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the professional standards which students must meet;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The programme team must provide further information as to how the education provider ensures designated medical practitioners are fully prepared for placements.

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors noted that designated medical practitioners (DMP) are able to access resources on the Blackboard Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) regarding their role in relation to the programme. However, in discussions with the DMPs the visitors noted that they had not been given access to this and that they received a booklet instead. The programme team confirmed that the VLE does not yet contain that information and DMPs are therefore not given access. From a review of the designated medical practitioners (DMP) handbook the visitors noted, on page 2, that DMPs are responsible for monitoring a student's progress. On

page 8 of the DMP handbook, it states that DMPs are required to meet with their students for an initial, intermediate and final interview to discuss their progress on placement. At the visit, the education provider stated that it is incumbent on the DMP to notify the education provider of any concerns they might have regarding a student's progress on placement. However, from the evidence provided it was not clear how the education provider informs the DMP about their responsibility to report their concerns to the education provider about a student's progress on placement. As such the visitors could not see how DMPs are fully prepared for placements on the programme in relation to an understanding of communication and lines of responsibility, student progression and any other information which they are currently unable to access on VLE. Consequently, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how DMPs are fully prepared for placement including an understanding of communication and lines of responsibility as well as the assessment procedures relating to student progression.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing how they utilise the virtual learning environment (VLE) to support student learning.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors saw a demonstration of the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) Blackboard. The programme team mentioned that the blog and forum sections were not utilised by the students as they preferred to use the WhatsApp application to discuss learning issues, instead. The students confirmed that they do not use the VLE to communicate with each other about their learning on the programme. The students also stated that the way in which tutors use the VLE was not consistent across the programme team and this made it difficult for them to know where to access the information they require. As such, the education provider should consider reviewing how the VLE is used to support students learning particularly as the students spend a considerable time accessing learning from a remote setting. This should enable the education provider to ensure the VLE is effectively used.

Nicholas Haddington
James Pickard

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Buckinghamshire New University
Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
Date of visit	15 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 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 28 April 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 25 May 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 26 May 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 8 June 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 and independent prescribers.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the regulatory bodies considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a post graduate certificate in non-medical prescribing programme. The education provider, the regulatory bodies 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 for prescribing. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the regulatory bodies, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicholas Haddington (Independent prescriber) James Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Tamara Wasylec
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort, 2 cohorts per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2017
Chair	Phil Wood (Buckinghamshire New University)
Secretary	Shabana Hussain (Buckinghamshire New University)
Members of the joint panel	Elli Smith (Internal Panel Member) Lisa Ooi (Internal Panel Member) Ohio Orumen (Internal Panel Member) Jeanette Hocking (Internal Panel Member) Katherine Hardware (External Panel Member) Haifa Lyster (External Panel Member) Andy Husband (General Pharmaceutical Council) Chris Langley (General Pharmaceutical Council) Philippa Mc Simpson (General Pharmaceutical Council)

	Brian Furman (General Pharmaceutical Council)
	Joanne Pike (Nursing & 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	☒	☐	☐

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 Independent and Supplementary nurse prescribing programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 43 of the standards have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining six standards.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to clearly articulate the information applicants require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme and where applicants can access this information, prior to applying.

Reason: To demonstrate how this standard is met the visitors were directed to the marketing material, programme specification and application form, however, the marketing material was not submitted as evidence. The programme team stated that the information would be made available to applicants prior to applying via the programme's web page, however, the visitors were not provided with any evidence to demonstrate how this would be presented to applicants and the information that would be included. The visitors note that without seeing how applicants can access the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on this programme prior to applying they cannot be certain that this standard is met. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors understood that applicants have the opportunity to study the programme at level 6 (Graduate certificate non-medical prescribing) or level 7, (Post graduate certificate non-medical prescribing). In discussion with the students, the students stated that they could not apply to the level 7 programme if they had not previously completed a level 6 qualification. However, in discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that the programme would consider students who have not studied at level 6 previously but had recent experience of studying at level 7. Due to the inconsistency in the information provided, the visitors could not see how the applicant is given the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the level of study required, the prerequisites for study on the programme and how this is clearly communicated to applicants, prior to applying.

A.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to the selection and entry criteria, including their policy on the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning for this programme, how it is applied and how this is communicated to applicants and students

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors understood that applicants have the opportunity to study the programme at level 6 or level 7. In discussion with the students, the students stated that an entry requirement for studying the level 7 programme is that students must have completed a level 6 qualification previously. However, in discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that the programme would consider students who have not studied at level 6 previously but had recent experience of studying at level 7. The programme team further explained that they would apply the university policy regarding AP(E)L. However, the visitors did not see evidence as to how the AP(E)L policy would be applied on the programme and how it would be appropriate to assess a student's ability to study the programme at level 7.

As such the visitors were unclear on the policy around APEL for this course and how it will be applied. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate their selection and entry criteria, including their policy on the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning for this programme, how it will be applied and how it will be communicated to applicants and students.

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

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

Reason: From a review of the context document on page 15 the visitors noted a reference to 'accreditation' by the HCPC. However, the HCPC approves programmes rather than accredits them. Additionally, on page 15 of the portfolio documents a clinical competency is repeated so both competency 10 and 11 are the same. The visitors therefore require the documentation to be revised to remove all instances of incorrect terminology and inaccurate information about the programme to ensure that the resources to support student learning in all settings are effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate that any significant changes made as a response to the internal validation event have been mitigated against, so the way the programme meets the standards for prescribing is not significantly impacted.

Reason: Through discussion at the visit, and from the final conclusions of the internal validation panel it was clear that revisions will be made to the assessment strategy to meet conditions set by the joint panel. The visitors considered the programme documentation provided prior to the visit. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors need to review any significant changes made due to the education provider's response to the internal validation event. To evidence that this condition is met, the education provider may wish to provide the programme documentation that has been revised, or provide an overview of their response to the internal validation event.

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 visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics on their prescribing practice.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors could not see where in the curriculum the students learn about the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) on their prescribing practice or how the education provider ensures student understanding. In discussions with the programme team, the staff assured the visitors that the SCPEs were embedded in the

learning and assessment on the programme. As such, the visitors require evidence to clarify where in the curriculum the students learn about the implications of the SCPEs on prescribing practice and by what means the education provider assess this learning.

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

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

Reason: From a review of the designated medical practitioners (DMP) handbook, the visitors noted, on page 2, that DMPs are responsible for monitoring a student's progress. On page 8 of the DMP handbook, it states that a DMP is required to meet with their student for an initial, intermediate and final interview to discuss their progress on placement. At the visit, the education provider stated that it is incumbent on the DMP to notify the education provider of any concerns they might have regarding a student's progress as a result of these meetings. From the documentation provided and in discussions with the programme team and designated medical practitioners (DMPs), the visitors were made aware that communication between the DMPs and education providers was informal and based on the nature of their good relationships with the DMPs. However the visitors could not see, from the evidence provided, the systems in place to maintain regular, formal and effective collaboration with DMPs. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine from the evidence and discussions how the education provider will ensure they have regular and effective collaboration with the DMPs, particularly in relation to how a student's progress is monitored, and consequently how this standard is met. The visitors require further evidence to show this standard is met. This standard is linked to the following standard on practice placement.

D.10 Students and designated medical practitioners must be fully prepared for the practice placement environment, which will include being given information about:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of the experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the professional standards which students must meet;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The programme team must provide further information as to how the education provider ensures designated medical practitioners are fully prepared for placements.

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors noted that designated medical practitioners (DMP) are able to access resources on the Blackboard Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) regarding their role in relation to the programme. However, in discussions with the DMPs the visitors noted that they had not been given access to this and that they received a booklet instead. The programme team confirmed that the VLE does not yet contain that information and DMPs are therefore not given access. From a review of the designated medical practitioners (DMP) handbook the visitors noted, on page 2, that DMPs are responsible for monitoring a student's progress. On

page 8 of the DMP handbook, it states that DMPs are required to meet with their students for an initial, intermediate and final interview to discuss their progress on placement. At the visit, the education provider stated that it is incumbent on the DMP to notify the education provider of any concerns they might have regarding a student's progress on placement. However, from the evidence provided it was not clear how the education provider informs the DMP about their responsibility to report their concerns to the education provider about a student's progress on placement. As such the visitors could not see how DMPs are fully prepared for placements on the programme in relation to an understanding of communication and lines of responsibility, student progression and any other information which they are currently unable to access on VLE. Consequently, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how DMPs are fully prepared for placement including an understanding of communication and lines of responsibility as well as the assessment procedures relating to student progression.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing how they utilise the virtual learning environment (VLE) to support student learning.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors saw a demonstration of the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) Blackboard. The programme team mentioned that the blog and forum sections were not utilised by the students as they preferred to use the WhatsApp application to discuss learning issues, instead. The students confirmed that they do not use the VLE to communicate with each other about their learning on the programme. The students also stated that the way in which tutors use the VLE was not consistent across the programme team and this made it difficult for them to know where to access the information they require. As such, the education provider should consider reviewing how the VLE is used to support students learning particularly as the students spend a considerable time accessing learning from a remote setting. This should enable the education provider to ensure the VLE is effectively used.

Nicholas Haddington
James Pickard

hcpc | health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme name	MSc Podiatry (pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time accelerated
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Date of visit	8 – 9 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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 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 25 May 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 15 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 reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the BSc Podiatry. The education provider and the professional body participated in separate scrutiny of both programmes; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the MSc Podiatry only. A separate report exists for the BSc Podiatry. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Wendy Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Diane Whitlock (Lay visitor) Sharon Wiener-Ogilvie (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Niall Gooch
HCPC observer	Adam Bird (Australia and New Zealand Podiatry Accreditation Council) Rachel Portelli (Australia and New Zealand Podiatry Accreditation Council)
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2017
Chair	Phil Mandy (University of Brighton)
Secretary	Rachel Quinn (University of Brighton)

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 BSc Podiatry 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 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining eight SETs.

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

The visitors have also made two 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: Prior to the start of the application process, the education provider must ensure that appropriate information about the programme is provided to potential applicants, allowing them to make an informed decision about taking up a place on the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team that information about what was required of applicants before they could take up a place on the programme, such as passing an enhanced DBS check and an occupational health check, was only communicated in materials available at selection days or in the handbook given to students when they started the programme. The visitors considered that, from the evidence provided, the timing of the provision of the information could impact on the ability of applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme. They noted that a number of the applicants were potentially disrupting existing careers to apply to the programme, and so may require the information as soon as possible to be able to limit their uncertainty about the requirements of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to what information is provided to applicants and at what points in the application process this information would be provided. In this way the visitors will be able to determine how the education provider ensures that applicants have all the information they require in order to make informed decisions about taking up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: Prior to the start of the application process, the education provider must ensure that potential applicants have access to appropriate information about what kind of previous study will be considered relevant in the application process.

Reason: From discussion with the programme team and senior team, the visitors noted that the education provider expects a proportion of the MSc students and applicants to be mature students or career changers. There is a relatively high number of such students on the existing BSc. The visitors considered it likely that these students will come from a variety of educational backgrounds. However, they could not see evidence that the materials designed for applicants and potential applicants made it clear what kind of recent relevant academic experience would be acceptable for the MSc. The visitors considered that, from the evidence provided, the timing of the provision of the information could impact on the ability of applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme. They noted that a number of the applicants were potentially disrupting existing careers to apply to the programme, and so may require the information as soon as possible to be able to limit their uncertainty about the requirements of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to what information is provided to applicants and at what points in the application process this information would be provided. In this way the visitors will be able to determine how the education provider ensures that applicants have all the

information they require in order to make informed decisions about taking up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers will be involved in the programme, why this involvement is appropriate and how service users and carers will be able to feed back to the programme team about their experience with students.

Reason: The visitors were able to talk to service users and carers about their involvement with students on the BSc, and found that all students had frequent interaction with service users and carers in clinical work throughout the programme. The visitors were made aware that this interaction with service users and carers was at the Leaf Hospital, the podiatry clinic that is run by the programme and where students treat service users and carers, gaining practical experience in a placement setting. The visitors also learned from discussion with service users and carers that they had some involvement with objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs). However, the visitors could not see in the evidence provided any records of this involvement, any records of feedback provided, or any formal mechanisms for feedback about students or the programme, from service users and carers to the programme team.

Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of how service users and carers will be involved specifically in the MSc programme, particularly in regard to how feedback from service users and carers will be incorporated. This evidence should detail how service users and carers will be involved in the MSc, why this involvement is appropriate for this level and type of programme, why the service users and carers involved are appropriate for the programme, and what support mechanisms the education provider has to support this involvement. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that demonstrates clearly which practice placements are linked to which theoretical modules and which learning outcomes.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were able to view evidence about placement structure and at the visit they were able to have discussions with placement providers. However, in their reading of the documentation provided, and in their discussions with practice placement providers, they were not always clear as to which modules and were linked to which learning outcomes. This was particularly the case for Pre-registration Clinical Practice 4 as they did not have a module descriptor. The visitors were therefore unclear as to how students and practice placement educators were clear about what learning outcomes need to be met at which placements and how these learning outcomes were to be achieved. In order to provide as much clarity as possible for students, staff and placement educators, the visitors therefore require further evidence as to which practice placements are linked to which modules and learning outcomes. In this way the visitors will be able to see exactly how

the practice placements support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that a process is in place for ensuring that enough placement practice educators are available, and that they are appropriately qualified and experienced.

Reason: The visitors were able to have extensive discussions about the practice placements with the programme team and practice placement educators. The visitors noted that there were clearly good working relationships between individuals on the programme team and those responsible for practice placements, and that there were enough placements for the students with appropriately qualified and experienced staff. However, the visitors were not able to see evidence of agreements between the programme team and the placement providers being formalised in writing, which would help to ensure continuity and stability of approval and monitoring in the event of personnel changes on the programme team or at the placement locations. They therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of the process for monitoring of placement staff's qualifications and experience being set down in writing.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
* **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
* **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
* **expectations of professional conduct;**
* **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
* **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that all practice placement educators have a clear understanding before placements start of what is expected of them regarding assessment of students at MSc level.

Reason: The visitors were able to discuss practice placements with the placement educators and the programme team, and they considered that the practice placement educators were very clear in their understanding of how to assess BSc students and so ensure appropriate progression and achievement for those students. However, the visitors were not able to see that the practice placement educators were as clear on the different approaches to assessment that might be required for students on an MSc. For example the programme team said in discussions that students coming starting the MSc were more likely than students starting the BSc to already have some relevant skills. As such the visitors were unclear, form the evidence provided, as to how the practice placement educators are being fully prepared to assess students on this programme. Therefore they require the education provider to provide evidence showing what procedures are in place to ensure that practice placement educators are prepared for the methods of assessment that the programme team have judged to be appropriate for this level of study. In this way the visitors will be able to see that placement educators are fully prepared to assess MSc students.

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 ensure that the methods of assessment used are appropriate to measuring the learning outcomes of particular modules, and that they ensure that students are able to demonstrate that they have met the standards of proficiency for chiropodists / podiatrists.

Reason: The visitors were able to discuss assessment methods with the programme team and review the relevant parts of the documentation. They noted that, in some modules, the learning outcomes for the programme were only assessed by one method, for example 'Health Psychology and Professional Practice', 'Musculoskeletal disorders of the foot and lower limb' and 'Research Design and Ethics'. The visitors were therefore unclear as to how students could be adequately assessed as having met all of the relevant learning outcomes when only one assessment method is utilised. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how the assessment methods employed ensure that all students can meet the relevant learning outcomes and therefore can meet all of the relevant standards of proficiency.

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

Condition: The education provider must review categorisation of mandatory and compulsory modules in order to provide clarity for students, and ensure that the categorisation is correctly aligned to the level of the module.

Reason: The visitors were able to review assessment regulations, and discuss assessment with students and the programme team. The programme team and the students seemed clear in their understanding of the difference between 'mandatory' and 'compulsory' modules. However, the visitors were not able to see that there always clarity about the meaning of 'mandatory' and 'compulsory' modules in the programme documentation. They considered that this ambiguity might make it harder for students to understand progression and achievement within the programme. They therefore require that an explanation of the difference be included in all module descriptors. In this way the visitors will be able to see that all students can understand the requirements for achievement and progression.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify the level at which the module "NHS Placement 2 (pre-registration)" is intended to be situated.

Reason: From viewing the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team, the visitors were not clear at which level the planned "NHS Placement 2 (pre-registration)" module was intended to run. The module stretches over two years and the visitors were not able to see how it could be ensured that all students or staff would be able to understand the progression points between Years 1 and 2, or about how the decision about progression was made, or what happened if a student failed Year 1.

The visitors therefore require the education provider to amend assessment regulations and related programme documentation in order to clearly explain how progression and achievement within the module worked. In this way the visitors will be able to see that there is clarity for both staff and students about progressions and achievement on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must review documents mapping the programme's learning outcomes to the standards of proficiency for chiropodists / podiatrists, to ensure that students can accurately monitor their own progress.

Reason: The visitors were able to review documents mapping the learning outcomes of modules to the standards of proficiency for chiropodists / podiatrists, and to discuss these learning outcomes and modules with the programme team. For some of the module descriptors, for example 'Dermatology' and 'Local Anaesthetic and Surgery', the visitors were not clear how the learning outcomes were aligned to the standards of proficiency for chiropodists / podiatrists. They considered that students may encounter difficulties in understanding what was required for progression and achievement within the programme. The visitors therefore require that module descriptors state clearly which learning outcomes are being assessed. In this way the visitors will be able to see how students are enabled to understand requirements for progression and achievement.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the wording of the module description for the module 'Musculoskeletal disorders of the foot and lower limb'.

Reason: In the evidence provided the visitors saw the module descriptors and were satisfied that the standard was met. However, in this module mentioned above they considered that the brief description of module content did not fully describe the areas that students would study on this part of the programme. They therefore suggest that the document be reviewed to ensure that it will give students a clearer indication of module content, and so will support student learning as effectively as possible.

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the practice placement plan to ensure that it provides maximum clarity and uses correct terminology.

Reason: In the evidence provided the visitors saw the documentation that related to the practice placements and how placements are due to be undertaken throughout this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the standard was met. However, they were unclear about the detail of the placement plan in places, for example it was sometimes difficult to see how long placements lasted, or what module they were connected to. They therefore suggest that the document be reviewed for clarity – and use up-to-date references, for example, replacing references to 'HPC' with 'HCPC'.

<div align="right">

Wendy Smith
Diane Whitlock
Sharon Wiener-Ogilvie

</div>

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Date of visit	8 – 9 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 '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 9 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 25 May 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 15 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. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the MSc Podiatry. The education provider and the professional body participated in separate scrutiny of both programmes; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the BSc Podiatry only. A separate report exists for the MSc Podiatry. 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, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Wendy Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Diane Whitlock (Lay visitor) Sharon Wiener-Ogilvie (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive officer	Niall Gooch
HCPC observers	Adam Bird (Australian and New Zealand Podiatry Accreditation Council) Rachel Portelli (Australian and New Zealand Podiatry Accreditation Council)
Proposed student numbers	40 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
First approved intake	September 1993
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	Phil Mandy (University of Brighton)
Secretary	Rachel Quinn (University of Brighton)

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 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 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 two recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: Prior to the start of the application process, the education provider must ensure that appropriate information about the programme is provided to potential applicants, allowing them to make an informed decision about taking up a place on the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team that information about what was required of applicants before they could take up a place on the programme, such as passing an enhanced DBS check and an occupational health check, was only communicated in materials available at selection days or in the handbook given to students when they started the programme. The visitors considered that, from the evidence provided, the timing of the provision of the information could impact on the ability of applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme. They noted that a number of the applicants were potentially disrupting existing careers to apply to the programme, and so may require the information as soon as possible to be able to limit their uncertainty about the requirements of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to what information is provided to applicants and at what points in the application process this information would be provided. In this way the visitors will be able to determine how the education provider ensures that applicants have all the information they require in order to make informed decisions about taking up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: Prior to the start of the application process, the education provider must ensure that there is clear information for applicants to access which details the education provider's requirements and expectations concerning prior (experiential) learning.

Reason: The visitors could not see, in the evidence provided, clear information for applicants which describes the education provider's entry requirements for people coming to the programme on a non-standard route, for example after time away from formal education. In discussion with students the visitors were told that approximately 30 per cent of the students on the programme were mature students or career-changers. The visitors were also made aware, in their reading of the documentary evidence provided, that there is an education provider recognition of prior (experiential) learning (RP(E)L) policy, which can be utilised by applicants to this programme. However the visitors could not see, from the evidence provided, how information about the RP(E)L policy is provided to applicants to the programme. Given the cohort of students, and potential applicants, the visitors felt that it was important for applicants to be given clear information about the RP(E)L criteria they would have to meet in order to be offered a place on the programme. As such the visitors could not see how applicants were being given all of the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme. The visitors therefore require

further evidence to demonstrate how the programme admissions information clearly indicates what the requirements for admission to the programme are and what the requirements of the RP(E)L policy are.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme, why this involvement is appropriate and how service users and carers can feed back to the programme team about their experience with students.

Reason: The visitors were able to talk to service users and carers about their involvement with students, and found that all students had frequent interaction with service users and carers in clinical work throughout the programme. The visitors were made aware that this interaction with service users and carers was at the Leaf Hospital, the podiatry clinic that is run by the programme and where students treat service users and carers, gaining practical experience in a placement setting. The visitors also learned from discussion with service users and carers that they had some involvement with objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs). However, the visitors could not see in the evidence provided any records of this involvement, any records of feedback provided, evidence of how feedback was used, or any formal mechanisms for feedback about students or the programme, from service users and carers to the programme team. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of service users and carers' involvement in the programme, particularly in regard to how feedback from service users and carers is incorporated into the assessment and the monitoring of the programme. This evidence should detail how service users and carers are involved, why this involvement is appropriate for this programme, why the service users and carers involved are appropriate for the programme and what support mechanisms the education provider has to support this involvement. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that a process is in place for ensuring that enough placement practice educators are available, and that they are appropriately qualified and experienced.

Reason: The visitors were able to have extensive discussions about the practice placements with the programme team and practice placement educators. The visitors noted that there were clearly good working relationships between individuals on the programme team and those responsible for practice placements, and that there were enough placements for the students with appropriately qualified and experienced staff. However, the visitors were not able to see evidence of agreements between the programme team and the placement providers being formalised in writing, which would help to ensure continuity and stability of approval and monitoring in the event of personnel changes on the programme team or at the placement locations. They therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of the process for monitoring of placement staff's qualifications and experience being set down in writing.

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 that the learning outcomes that students are expected to achieve in each module ensure that students are adequately assessed so that they can meet the standards of proficiency.

Reason: From reading the module descriptors in the documentation, in certain modules the visitors were not able to see which learning outcomes were assessed by which instrument of assessment. For example in 'Clinical Practice 2' appeared to have its first learning outcome assessed by two different methods of assessment, meaning that the learning outcome could be met even if a student had failed one of the methods of assessment. A similar overlap of learning outcomes also occurs in 'Clinical Practice 4'. The visitors considered that this could lead to students passing modules even though they had not met all the expected learning outcomes. They therefore require the education provider to review the module description to link all learning outcomes to a specific instrument of assessment. In this way the visitors will be able to see how students will be required to meet all the learning outcomes of a module.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that there is clear information in the programme documentation which states that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register.

Reason: From their reading of the documentation provided the visitors were aware that the education provider does award aegrotat awards when "…the student might have obtained their award had it not been for illness or another valid cause" (General Examination and Assessment Regulations, section D, part 8). However, in evidence provided the visitors could not see a clear statement which clearly articulated that an aegrotat award could not be used to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to how the education provider ensures that there is clear information provided to students that any aegrotat award would not provide them with eligibility to apply to the Register.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team should revisit the programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is correct.

Reason: The visitors noted a number of small errors in the documentation, for example references to 'the HPC' rather than 'the HCPC', and duplication and omissions in the documents mapping learning outcomes and assessment methods. The visitors therefore suggest that the education provider review the programme documentation for accuracy, and update or revise where necessary.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing documents mapping assessment methods and learning outcomes.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that appropriate assessment methods were being used to measure the learning outcomes and therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, they considered that it was not always clear in the various mapping documents which learning outcomes were linked to which assessment methods, and so they suggest to the education provider that they should review these documents with a view to providing more clarity. In this way they may be better able to link key elements of the assessment strategy with the achievement of the learning outcomes of the programme.

<div align="right">
Wendy Smith
Diane Whitlock
Sharon Wiener-Ogilvie
</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality / domain	Diagnostic radiographer
Date of visit	1 – 3 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 'radiographer' or 'diagnostic radiographer' 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 18 April 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 25 May 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 8 May 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 8 June 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 education provider reviewed the programme and the professional bodies considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BA (Hons) in Social Work. The education provider, the professional bodies and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist) Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer) Simon Mudie (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Rebecca Stent (Lead executive for the Diagnostic radiography/ Occupational therapy panel) Tamara Wasylec (Lead executive for the Social work panel)
Proposed student numbers	50 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
First approved intake	July 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	Heather McLaughlin (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Secretary	Alison Geargeoura (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Members of the joint panel	Kene Igweonu (Internal Panel Member) Marcus Jackson (External Panel Member) Alison Coates (Quality and Standards Representative) David Bennett (Learning and Teaching representative)

	Alexandra Telekova (Student panel member)
	Jonathan McConnell (College of Radiographers)

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 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 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 recommendation 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

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of staff undertaking the role of personal tutor on this programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were satisfied with the overall staff numbers in place on the programme. The visitors also noted that the programme is moving from two campuses to one campus and that there will only be one intake of students per year from September 2017. Furthermore, the visitors also learnt from the documentation and discussions at the visit that there will be no increase in student numbers. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors understood that there will be one personal tutor to support approximately 25 students on one cohort and that there will be two personal tutors in total to support around 50 students on one cohort. However, the visitors were not clear as to whether these two personal tutors would only be supporting one cohort or whether they would be supporting students across other cohorts at the same time. In addition, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider has determined that this number of personal tutors is appropriate to support this number of students. As such, the visitors require further evidence to clarify how many students personal tutors will be supporting on the programme at any one time and how the education provider has determined that this number is appropriate in order to deliver an effective 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 terminology in use is 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 contained inaccuracies in relation to HCPC regulation. For example, at the top of the student consent form for students to participate as a service users in practical sessions, it is specified that this is an "HCPC requirement". However, the HCPC does not stipulate that a consent form specifically must be used to obtain a student's consent to act as a service user. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that it is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC so that the resources to support student learning in all settings will be 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 education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that, where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols will be used to obtain their consent.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to a consent form which students sign at the beginning of the programme. However, in discussions with the students at the visit, students were unclear about when they were participating as service users in the current programme and they did not recall when or how they gave their consent to participate in these sessions. Therefore, the visitors were not satisfied that students will be able to give their informed consent to participate in these sessions as service users throughout the programme and that students will be clear about the sessions where they can opt out. As such, the visitors require further evidence about the protocols in place to ensure that students are giving their informed consent when they participate as service uses in practical sessions and that they are clear about when they can opt out.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate what they define as "low attendance" at placement and how this definition and any consequences of attendance issues at placement are clearly communicated to students.

Reason: In documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that 100 per cent placement attendance is required and that students will have to make up any missed placement experience. However, the visitors noted from the training documentation for practice educators that "low attendance" could lead to a failed placement. At the visit, the programme team stated that low attendance would be considered as part of the reasoning for a failed placement along with other factors and that this would be considered on a case by case basis. The visitors were unclear, however, as to what would constitute "low attendance" and when this would contribute to a student failing a placement. In addition, the visitors could not see how this consequence of missed placement experience was communicated to students in the documentation provided. As such, the visitors require further evidence as to when the education provider would consider attendance as "low attendance" at placement so that issues with attendance can be dealt with consistently. The visitors also require further evidence about how the education provider communicates this to students including all potential consequences of missed placement experience, such as the failure of a placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that they have identified the attendance requirements at the academic setting including how this will be monitored and communicated to students so that any issues with attendance can be dealt with consistently by the education provider.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the university wide policy for attendance at the academic setting supplied in the student handbook which stipulates that all teaching sessions are "compulsory". However, in discussions with the programme team and students, there were differing statements about the actual attendance requirements and whether attendance is always monitored and recorded for each taught session. The programme team stated that they say all sessions are

mandatory so that students are encouraged to attend all sessions but that there is not a 100 per cent attendance requirement due to sickness and other circumstances. In addition, the programme team stated that attendance will be monitored in the new programme with an electronic card system which students will use to record their attendance. It was not clear from these discussions what the attendance requirements are for the programme and what the consequences of missed attendance would be when attendance falls below a certain point and, therefore, how any issues with attendance are dealt with consistently by the education provider. In addition, it was not clear from the documentation for students how attendance will be recorded in the new programme and how students are clear about attendance requirements and the consequences of falling below this requirement. As such, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the programme documentation will be used to ensure that students are clear about the attendance requirements at the academic setting, the consequences of falling below this requirement, how the education provider will deal with any attendance issues consistently and how attendance will be monitored.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that they ensure that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the educational audit form used by the education provider for approving and monitoring practice placements. At the visit, the programme team stated that they would expect this policy to be considered within the audit. However, from this document, the visitors could not see how this document is being used to ensure that all placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place. The visitors noted that this could be a particular issue for placements at private providers which are less likely to have these policies in place. As such, the visitors require further evidence as to how the education provider will utilise this audit tool to ensure that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
  * **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
  * **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
  * **expectations of professional conduct;**
  * **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
  * **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that students, practice placement providers and educators are fully prepared for placement in relation to the duration of all placement experience.

Reason: In documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted the following statement in the modality placement guidelines (Practice Assessment Documents for year 1, 2 and 3): "Recommended hours in each is 20, apart from CT where the total is 56 hours required." In discussions at the visit, the programme team clarified that 20 hours was a minimum requirement rather than a "recommended" number of hours and that attendance is monitored by the education provider to ensure that these minimum hours have been completed. However, the visitors noted that students, practice placement providers and educators could be unclear about this when referring to the documentation. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that students, practice placement providers and educators will be fully prepared for placement in relation to the duration of placement experience in the modalities and how this is accurately reflected in the documentation.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
  * **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
  * **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
  * **expectations of professional conduct;**
  * **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
  * **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that students, practice placement providers and educators are fully prepared for placement in relation to an understanding of what would constitute "low attendance" at placement.

Reason: In documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that 100 per cent placement attendance is required and that students will have to make up any missed placement experience. However, the visitors noted from the training documentation for practice educators that "low attendance" could lead to a failed placement. At the visit, the programme team stated that low attendance would be considered as part of the reasoning for a failed placement along with other factors and that this would be considered on a case by case basis. The visitors were unclear, however, as to what would constitute "low attendance". In addition, the visitors could not see how this was clearly communicated to students, placement providers and educators in their preparation for placement. As such, the visitors require further evidence as to when the education provider would consider attendance as "low attendance" at placement so that issues with attendance can be dealt with consistently. The visitors also require further evidence about how the education provider communicates this to students, practice placement providers and educators so that they are fully prepared for placement.

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

Condition: The programme team must clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme in relation to reassessments for both the academic and practice elements, and how this information will be communicated accurately and consistently to students.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, it is stated that the programme follows the university regulations with regard to reassessments. On page 32 of the Regulation and Credit Framework for the Conferment of Awards document it states that "The Board of Examiners will normally offer each referred student a single opportunity to make good the relevant assessment, except at level four where there will be two reassessment opportunities." However, at the programme team meeting for the Paramedic Science programme, it was confirmed that all programmes will have two reassessment opportunities at each level of the programme for the academic and practice element of the programme. As such, the visitors are currently unclear about the reassessment opportunities for students if they fail an academic or practice element in this programme. Therefore, the programme team must provide further evidence to clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme in relation to reassessments for both the academic and practice elements, and how this information will be communicated consistently and accurately to students.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider changing the name of the 'voluntary placement' to make it clearer that this is a mandatory placement undertaken in a voluntary sector organisation.

Reason: It was clear from the description of this placement in the documentation that this is a placement undertaken in the voluntary sector and that there is a requirement to complete this placement in order to progress within the programme. In discussions with the programme team and students at the visit, it was clear that this was the case and that students understood this to be a mandatory placement in the voluntary sector. However, the visitors recommend that the education provider reviews the title of this placement to more accurately reflect in the documentation that this is not an optional placement to avoid any future risk of students misunderstanding the requirements to progress within the programme.

Angela Ariu
Shaaron Pratt
Simon Mudie

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	1 – 3 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 'occupational therapist' 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 18 April 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 25 May 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 8 May 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 8 June 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 education provider reviewed the programme and the professional bodies considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and BA (Hons) in Social Work. The education provider, the professional bodies and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist) Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer) Simon Mudie (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Rebecca Stent (Lead executive for the Diagnostic Radiography/ Occupational Therapy panel) Tamara Wasylec (Lead executive for the Social Work panel)
Proposed student numbers	70 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
First approved intake	September 2000
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	Heather McLaughlin (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Secretary	Alison Geargeoura (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Members of the joint panel	Kene Igweonu (Internal Panel Member) Helen Carey (External Panel Member) Alison Coates (Quality and Standards Representative) David Bennett (Learning and Teaching representative)

	Alexandra Telekova (Student panel member)
	Dr Ruth Heames (College of Occupational Therapists)
	Dr Janice Jones (College of Occupational Therapists)
	Anne Longmore (College of Occupational Therapists)
	Maureen Shiells (College of Occupational Therapists)

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 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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 terminology in use is 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 contained inaccuracies in relation to HCPC regulation. For example, on page 36 of the programme specification there is the following statement: "In accordance with WFOT, COT and HCPC requirements the programme management of the Occupational Therapy programme will be by a registered occupational therapist with a minimum of six years post registered professional experience and three years in higher education." Furthermore, at the top of the student consent form for students to participate as service users in practical sessions, it is specified that this is an "HCPC requirement". However, the HCPC does not set a requirement for the level and type of experience that programme leaders must have and does not stipulate that a consent form specifically must be used to obtain a student's consent to act as a service user. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that it is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC so that the resources to support student learning in all settings will be 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 education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that, where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols will be used to obtain their consent.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to a consent form which students sign at the beginning of the programme. However, in discussions with the students at the visit, students were unclear about when they were participating as service users in the current programme and they did not recall when or how they gave their consent to participate in these sessions. Therefore, the visitors were not satisfied that students will be able to give their informed consent to participate in these sessions as service users throughout the programme and that students will be clear about the sessions where they can opt out. As such, the visitors require further evidence about the protocols in place to ensure that students are giving their informed consent when they participate as service uses in practical sessions and that they are clear about when they can opt out.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that they have identified the attendance requirements at the academic setting including how this will be monitored and communicated to students so that any issues with attendance can be dealt with consistently by the education provider.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the university wide policy for attendance at the academic setting supplied in the student handbook which stipulates that all teaching sessions are "compulsory". However, in discussions with the programme team and students, there were differing statements about the actual attendance requirements and whether attendance is always monitored and recorded for each taught session. The programme team stated that they say all sessions are mandatory so that students are encouraged to attend all sessions but that there is not a 100 per cent attendance requirement due to sickness and other circumstances. In addition, the programme team stated that attendance will be monitored in the new programme with an electronic card system which students will use to record their attendance. It was not clear from these discussions what the attendance requirements were for the programme and what the consequences of missed attendance would be when attendance falls below a certain point and, therefore, how any issues with attendance are dealt with consistently by the education provider. In addition, it was not clear from the documentation for students how attendance will be recorded in the new programme and how students are clear about attendance requirements and the consequences of falling below this requirement. As such, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the programme documentation will be used to ensure that students are clear about the attendance requirements at the academic setting, the consequences of falling below this requirement, how the education provider will deal with any attendance issues consistently and how attendance will be monitored.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that they ensure that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the educational audit form used by the education provider for approving and monitoring practice placements. At the visit, the programme team stated that they would expect this policy to be considered within the audit. However, from this document, the visitors could not see how this document is being used to ensure that all placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place. The visitors noted that this could be a particular issue for placements at private providers which are less likely to have these policies in place. As such, the visitors require further evidence as to how the education provider will utilise this audit tool to ensure that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

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

Condition: The programme team must clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme in relation to reassessments for both the academic and practice elements, and how this information will be communicated accurately and consistently to students.

Reason: In documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted on page 39 of the placement handbook that "students will be offered a reassessment opportunity."

However, at the programme team meeting for the Paramedic Science programme, it was confirmed that all programmes will have two reassessment opportunities at each level of the programme for both the academic and practice element of the programme. As such, the visitors are currently unclear about the reassessment opportunities for students if they fail an academic or practice element in this programme. Therefore, the programme team must provide further evidence to clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme in relation to reassessments for both the academic and practice elements, and how this information will be communicated consistently and accurately to students.

Angela Ariu
Shaaron Pratt
Simon Mudie

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme name	BA (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	1 – 2 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 'social worker' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 April 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 25 May 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 8 May 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 25 May 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 – the programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme. 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	David Childs (Social worker in England)
	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England)
	Frances Ashworth (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Tamara Wasylec (Lead executive for the Social work panel)
	Rebecca Stent (Lead executive for the Diagnostic radiography/ Occupational therapy panel)
Proposed student numbers	40 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
First approved intake	July 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	Damian Coleman (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Secretary	Lauren Smyth (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Members of the joint panel	Andrew Whittaker (External Panel Member)
	Colm Fearon (Learning and Teaching representative)
	Lauren Smyth (Quality and Standards Officer)
	Gary Davy (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 ongoing approval, the visitors must be satisfied that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the relevant part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 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 recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the information provided to potential applicants, which ensures they are given the information they require to make an informed choice about applying to the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that potential applicants are directed to information about the social work bursary for students via a link to NHS Business Services Authority social work bursaries page on the university programme website. The visitors noted that the education provider is in receipt of a capping allocation for the bursary. As such, the education provider decides which students receive the bursary based on capping criteria set by the Department of Health. The website the students are directed to, does not hold information about how the education provider decides which students will be in receipt of the bursary. In this instance, students need to contact their education provider for information about how they select which students will be eligible for the bursary. However, the visitors could not see where this is communicated to the potential students. In discussion with the students, the criteria for eligibility was understood to be an achievement level of 60 per cent across assessments and attendance level of 40 per cent across the programme in the first year. However, in discussions with the programme team the visitors heard the criteria is 60 per cent attendance and 40 per cent for assessments. Because of the disparity in the information provided, the visitors require additional information demonstrating what the education provider's eligibility criteria is for students to apply for the social work bursary and how this communicated to potential students so that they can make an informed choice before applying 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 clarify whether accreditation of prior (experiential) learning will be permitted on this programme and, if it is, that it is appropriate to exempt students from elements of learning and / or assessment and how this is communicated to potential applicants and students.

Reason: From a review of the proposed programme specification, the visitors noted that accreditation of prior (experiential) learning with regards to practice learning is not permitted. However, in discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that applicants can apply for AP(E)L using the university wide accreditation of prior learning (APL) policy. Due to the disparity in the information provided the visitors were unclear about whether AP(E)L would be accepted on this programme and if it is, how the AP(E)L scheme would be used to appropriately exempt students from having to attain certain learning outcomes during practice learning. The visitors also could not see how applicants to the programme would be informed about the process, or whether any amount of credit could be considered through AP(E)L, and whether practice learning could be transferred or not. The visitors therefore require further evidence to clarify whether accreditation of prior (experiential) learning with regards to practice learning will be permitted in this programme and, if it is, that it is appropriate to exempt students

from elements of the learning and / or assessment and how it is communicated to applicants and students.

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 terminology in use is 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 contained inaccuracies in relation to HCPC regulation. For example, in the proposed programme specification, the visitors noted a statement with regards to accreditation of prior (experiential) learning to say that HCPC allows AP(E)L of practice learning in exceptional circumstances, however the HCPC does not stipulate that. The visitors also noted, at the top of the student consent form for students to participate as a service users in practical sessions, it is specified that this is an "HCPC requirement". However, the HCPC does not stipulate that a consent form specifically must be used to obtain a student's consent to act as a service user. In review of the proposed student programme handbook on page 5, the visitors noted that reference is made to The College of Social Work (TCSW) endorsing the professional aspects of the programme, however TCSW is no longer in existence and therefore cannot endorse this programme. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that it is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC so that the resources to support student learning in all settings will be effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that there will be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the communication between the practice placement provider and the education provider ensures the education provider has access to the information they require to be assured that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support the number of students on the programme in both statutory and private, voluntary and independent (PVI) practice placements. From discussions with the programme team and the statutory practice placement providers, the visitors learned that there exists a Teaching Partnership Operational Board of which Canterbury Christ Church University, Kent County Council and Medway Council are members. The visitors heard that Medway Council and Kent County Council hold lists of their qualified placement educators and they ensure that their practice educators have undertaken the relevant training Practice Educator Professional Standards for social work training (PEPs). Also, the practice placement providers informed the visitors that local work is currently on going to ensure that more staff will be trained as practice educators over the next three years. However, it was unclear how the education provider ensures that they are aware of the numbers of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at placements and how the education provider would maintain responsibility for ensuring all placement settings, including PVI placements, have an adequate number of

appropriately qualified and experienced staff. Therefore, the visitors require information which demonstrates how the education provider and practice placement providers regularly and effectively collaborate in order to ensure that the education provider can be sure that all practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff for the programme.

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

Conditions: The programme team must provide further evidence as to how they inform students about their ability to progress and achieve should they fail to complete any part of the programme.

Reason: On page 28 of the proposed practice learning handbook, it is stated that students are only permitted one opportunity to repeat a placement. However, on the chart found on page 7 of the proposed student handbook, the visitors noted that students will get two reassessment opportunities. The programme team confirmed that this was a typing error and that students will get only one chance at reassessment of a placement. Due to the disparity in the information provided, the visitors could not clearly identify how the education provider clearly communicates to students the number of times they would be able to repeat a placement on the programme. As such, the visitors require further evidence as to how students are informed about the requirements for student progression and achievement with regards to placement, on the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider that when they make changes to the programme, to include interprofessional learning, they will need to engage with the HCPC to identify how these changes may change how the programme continues to meet the standards.

Reason: It was the visitors' understanding that since the programme is unlinking from the interconnected, interprofessional programme delivery of the previous programme model that inter professional learning is not a part of the new programme model, but there are some elements of shared learning. The visitors noted that the education provider intends to integrate interprofessional learning into the programme, in future. Therefore when the education provider is ready to introduce this element into the programme the visitors recommend that the education provider considers how this may impact the programme continuing to meet this standard and how best to engage with HCPC about these changes.

David Childs
Gary Hickman
Frances Ashworth

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	13 – 15 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 'paramedic' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 28 April 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 25 May 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 12 May 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 8 June 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 education provider reviewed the programme. The visit also considered the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice 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 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 education provider, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Fellows (Paramedic) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner) Joanne Watchman (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Rebecca Stent
Proposed student numbers	50 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
First approved intake	September 2011
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	David Grummit (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Secretary	Lauren Smyth (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Members of the joint panel	Helen Taylor (Internal Panel Member) Susan Boardman (External Panel Member) Alison Coates (Quality and Standards Office) Kath Abiker (Learning and teaching representative) Alexandra Telekova (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 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 4 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that the admissions information given to applicants regarding academic entry requirements is clear, accurate and consistent so that applicants can make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

Reason: In documents provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that there was a difference in the mapping document and the website information in relation to the A level grade requirements for this programme. In discussions with the programme team, it was confirmed that the entry requirements for September 2017 will be BBC at A level and that a science subject will no longer be required as is currently stated on the website. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the admissions information given to applicants regarding academic entry requirements is clear, accurate and consistent so that applicants can make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that the admissions information given to applicants regarding any driving requirements for the programme is clear and consistent so that applicants can make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

Reason: From a review of the website information for applicants provided ahead of the visit, the visitors noted the following statement: "You will be required to pass the C1 driving test by the end of your first year on the programme e.g. by August 2018 if you start in September 2017." However, at the visit, the programme team said students do not need a C1 driving license as a requirement for this programme but that they tell applicants this would be an advantage as a paramedic. Due to the disparity in information provided, the visitors were unclear as to what the driving requirements are for the programme and how potential applicants will be informed of these requirements consistently and clearly through the admissions procedures. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the admissions information given to applicants regarding any driving requirements for the programme is clear and consistent so that applicants can make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that they have identified the attendance requirements at the academic setting including how this will be monitored and communicated to students so that any issues with attendance can be dealt with consistently by the education provider.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the university wide policy for attendance at the academic setting supplied in the student handbook which stipulates that all teaching sessions are "compulsory". In discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the students were unclear about the actual attendance requirements for the academic element and whether attendance is always monitored and recorded for each session. The programme team stated that attendance will be monitored in the new programme with an electronic card system which students will use to record their attendance. The programme team also stated that they identify "lack of engagement" from students which triggers an investigation into a student's attendance. However, it was unclear as to what the education provider defines as "lack of engagement". It was also unclear from these discussions what the attendance requirements are for the programme and what the consequences of missed attendance would be when attendance falls below a certain point and, therefore, how any issues with attendance are dealt with consistently by the education provider. In addition, it was not clear from the documentation for students how attendance will be recorded in the new programme and how students are clear about attendance requirements and the consequences of falling below this requirement. As such, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the programme documentation will be used to ensure that students are clear about the attendance requirements at the academic setting, the consequences of falling below this requirement, how the education provider will deal with any attendance issues consistently and how attendance will be monitored.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that they ensure that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the educational audit form used by the education provider for approving and monitoring practice placements. However, from this document, the visitors could not see how this document is being used to ensure that all placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place. As such, the visitors require further evidence as to how the education provider will utilise this audit tool to ensure that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

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

Condition: The programme team must clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme in relation to reassessments for the practice element, and how this information will be communicated accurately and consistently to students.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that there were different statements about how many reassessments a student can undertake within the practice element of the programme. For example, in the Ongoing Achievement Record (OAR) documents, it states that a student is permitted one reassessment opportunity,

whereas on page 20 of the placement handbook it states that "If the student fails in practice a second attempt will be arranged" and then "Any student who does not pass at the second attempt will normally be offered a third attempt." At the visit, the programme team confirmed that students will be permitted two reassessment opportunities in both the practice and academic elements of the programme. Due to the disparity in information provided, the visitors were unclear about the number of reassessment opportunities for students if they fail a placement. As such, the programme team must provide further evidence to clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme in relation to reassessments for the practice element, and how this information will be communicated consistently and accurately to students.

Robert Fellows
Tony Scripps
Joanne Watchman

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church 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	13 – 15 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 ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 28 April 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 25 May 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 12 May 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 8 June 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 education provider reviewed the programme. The visit also considered the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science 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 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. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Fellows (Paramedic) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner) Joanne Watchman (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer	Rebecca Stent
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
First approved intake	September 2009
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	David Grummit (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Secretary	Lauren Smyth (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Members of the joint panel	Helen Taylor (Internal Panel Member) Michael Donnellon (External Panel Member) Alison Coates (Quality and Standards Office) Kath Abiker (Learning and teaching representative) Alexandra Telekova (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 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 4 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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 terminology in use is 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 contained inaccuracies in relation to HCPC regulation. For example, at the top of the student consent form for students to participate as a service users in practical sessions, it is specified that this is an "HCPC requirement". However, the HCPC does not stipulate that a consent form specifically must be used to obtain a student's consent to act as a service user. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that it is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC so that the resources to support student learning in all settings will be effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that they have identified the attendance requirements at the academic setting including how this will be monitored and communicated to students so that any issues with attendance can be dealt with consistently by the education provider.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the university wide policy for attendance at the academic setting supplied in the student handbook which stipulates that all teaching sessions are "compulsory". In discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the students were unclear about the actual attendance requirements for the academic element and whether attendance is always monitored and recorded for each session. The programme team stated that attendance will be monitored in the new programme with an electronic card system which students will use to record their attendance. However, it was unclear from these discussions what the attendance requirements are for the programme and what the consequences of missed attendance would be when attendance falls below a certain point and, therefore, how any issues with attendance are dealt with consistently by the education provider. In addition, it was not clear from the documentation for students how attendance will be recorded in the new programme and how students are clear about attendance requirements and the consequences of falling below this requirement. As such, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the programme documentation will be used to ensure that students are clear about the attendance requirements at the academic setting, the consequences of falling below this requirement, how the education provider will deal with any attendance issues consistently and how attendance will be monitored.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that they ensure that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the educational audit form used by the education provider for approving and monitoring practice placements. However, from this document, the visitors could not see how this document is being used to ensure that all placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place. As such, the visitors require further evidence as to how the education provider will utilise this audit tool to ensure that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

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

Condition: The programme team must clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme in relation to reassessments for the practice element, and how this information will be communicated accurately and consistently to students.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted from page 21 of the placement handbook that if a student fails in practice, "a second reassessment attempt will be arranged" and "Any student who does not pass at the reassessment attempt will normally be discontinued / withdrawn from the programme." However, at the visit, the education provider confirmed that students will be permitted two reassessment opportunities in both the practice and academic elements of the programme. Due to the disparity in information provided, the visitors were unclear about the number of reassessment opportunities for students if they fail a placement. As such, the programme team must provide further evidence to clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme in relation to reassessments for the practice element, and how this information will be communicated consistently and accurately to students.

Robert Fellows
Tony Scripps
Joanne Watchman

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	14-15 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 'occupational therapist'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 1 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 25 May 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 2 May 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 25 May 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 admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, 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	Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker in England) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Mohammed Jeewa (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2017
First approved intake	September 2009
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	Day one: David Beresford (University of Derby) Day two: Mark Wainman (University of Derby
Secretary	Chloe Jones (University of Derby)
Members of the joint panel	Jan Jensen (College of Occupational Therapists) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational Therapists) Carol Mytton (College of Occupational Therapists) Jo-Drummond-Child (Internal panel member)

	Sarah Barley-McMullen (Internal panel member)
	Fiona Douglas (External panel member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining one SET.

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 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

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

Condition: The education provider is required to revise the assessment regulations to ensure that they clearly specify that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility for admission to the register.

Reason: When reviewing the assessment regulations the visitors noted that there was no specific regulation regarding an aegrotat award. The visitors noted that the assessment regulations stated that only the named awards would provide eligibility to the register, however it was not clear whether an aegrotat award is available or whether an aegrotat award would provide admission to the register. At the visit the programme team stated that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility to apply to the register. Therefore without this requirement being clearly articulated in the assessment regulations, the visitors could not determine the requirements for an aegrotat award and therefore require further evidence to demonstrate the requirements ensuring that the standard is met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: It is recommended that the education provider take steps to further communicate the ways in which students can access learning resources.

Reason: During the visit the visitors were shown the range of learning resources available to students including the library and the online resources. The visitors were satisfied that the resources will effectively support the learning and teaching activities of the programme and that the standard was met. However when meeting with the students they expressed a concern that at times certain core textbooks were unavailable due to high demand. This issue was raised with the programme team who stated that students are able to request digitised copies of chapters when certain books are in high demand. As such the visitors could see that the arrangements were in place to ensure that the learning resources effectively supported the required learning and teaching activities of the programme, especially in times of high demand. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider consider how they communicate the ways in which students can access certain learning resources, including digitised chapters.

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

Recommendation: It is recommend that the education provider considers expanding their involvement of service users to ensure that involvement is consistent across the programmes.

Reason: At the visit the visitors met with two service users and carers and students to discuss the involvement of service users and carers in the programme. When meeting with students they stated that they had some involvement with service users across the programme including seminars, teaching and in the admissions process. However the experience of interaction with service users was inconsistent as some groups had varied interaction. When meeting with the service users there were two individuals who are involved with the programme in various roles. Therefore, the visitors were satisfied that service users and carers are involved in the programme and that they are suitably supported and trained. However the visitors noted that there were only two service users involved in what will be five cohorts of students a year. The programme team stated that there have been times where a service user has fallen ill and the sessions were cancelled. Considering the information provided the visitors were satisfied that the standard is met and that service users are involved in the programme, however they noted a risk that as the programme grows, the involvement of service users may become increasingly inconsistent. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider consider expanding the pool of service users and carers they involve on the programme to ensure that the involvement remains consistent across the programmes.

Vicki Lawson-Brown
Joanna Goodwin
Mohammed Jeewa

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	14-15 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 'occupational therapist'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 1 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 25 May 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 2 May 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 25 May 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 admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, 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	Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker in England)
	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist)
	Mohammed Jeewa (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2017
First approved intake	September 2009
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	Day one: David Beresford (University of Derby)
	Day two: Mark Wainman (University of Derby
Secretary	Chloe Jones (University of Derby)
Members of the joint panel	Jan Jensen (College of Occupational Therapists)
	Caroline Grant (College of Occupational Therapists)
	Carol Mytton (College of Occupational Therapists)
	Jo-Drummond-Child (Internal panel member)

	Sarah Barley-McMullen (Internal panel member)
	Fiona Douglas (External panel member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining one SET.

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 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

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

Condition: The education provider is required to revise the assessment regulations to ensure that they clearly specify that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility for admission to the register.

Reason: When reviewing the assessment regulations the visitors noted that there was no specific regulation regarding an aegrotat award. The visitors noted that the assessment regulations stated that only the named awards would provide eligibility to the register, however it was not clear whether an aegrotat award is available or whether an aegrotat award would provide admission to the register. At the visit the programme team stated that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility to apply to the register. Therefore without this requirement being clearly articulated in the assessment regulations, the visitors could not determine the requirements for an aegrotat award and therefore require further evidence to demonstrate the requirements ensuring that the standard is met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: It is recommended that the education provider take steps to further communicate the ways in which students can access learning resources.

Reason: During the visit the visitors were shown the range of learning resources available to students including the library and the online resources. The visitors were satisfied that the resources will effectively support the learning and teaching activities of the programme and that the standard was met. However when meeting with the students they expressed a concern that at times certain core textbooks were unavailable due to high demand. This issue was raised with the programme team who stated that students are able to request digitised copies of chapters when certain books are in high demand. As such the visitors could see that the arrangements were in place to ensure that the learning resources effectively supported the required learning and teaching activities of the programme, especially in times of high demand. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider consider how they communicate the ways in which students can access certain learning resources, including digitised chapters.

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

Recommendation: It is recommend that the education provider considers expanding their involvement of service users to ensure that involvement is consistent across the programmes.

Reason: At the visit the visitors met with two service users and carers and students to discuss the involvement of service users and carers in the programme. When meeting with students they stated that they had some involvement with service users across the programme including seminars, teaching and in the admissions process. However the experience of interaction with service users was inconsistent as some groups had varied interaction. When meeting with the service users there were two individuals who are involved with the programme in various roles. Therefore, the visitors were satisfied that service users and carers are involved in the programme and that they are suitably supported and trained. However the visitors noted that there were only two service users involved in what will be five cohorts of students a year. The programme team stated that there have been times where a service user has fallen ill and the sessions were cancelled. Considering the information provided the visitors were satisfied that the standard is met and that service users are involved in the programme, however they noted a risk that as the programme grows, the involvement of service users may become increasingly inconsistent. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider consider expanding the pool of service users and carers they involve on the programme to ensure that the involvement remains consistent across the programmes.

<div align="right">

Vicki Lawson-Brown
Joanna Goodwin
Mohammed Jeewa

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	14 – 15 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 'art therapist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 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 25 May 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 2 May 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 25 May 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 reviewed 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	Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker in England) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Mohammed Jeewa (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2017
Chair	Day 1: David Beresford (University of Derby) Day 2: Mark Wainman (University of Derby
Secretary	Chloe Jones (University of Derby)
Members of the joint panel	Jan Jensen (College of Occupational Therapists) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational Therapists) Carol Mytton (College of Occupational Therapists) Jo-Drummond-Child (Internal panel member) Sarah Barley-McMullen (Internal panel member) Fiona Douglas (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 from the last two years 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 BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy Full time and MSc Occupational Therapy Full time programmes, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining one SET.

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

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

Condition: The education provider is required to revise the assessment regulations to ensure that they clearly specify that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility for admission to the register.

Reason: When reviewing the assessment regulations the visitors noted that there was no specific regulation regarding an aegrotat award. The visitors noted that the assessment regulations stated that only the named awards would provide eligibility to the register, however it was not clear whether an aegrotat award is available or whether an aegrotat award would provide admission to the register. At the visit the programme team stated that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility to apply to the register. Therefore without this requirement being clearly articulated in the assessment regulations, the visitors could not determine the requirements for an aegrotat award and therefore require further evidence to demonstrate the requirements ensuring that the standard is met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: It is recommended that the education provider take steps to further communicate the ways in which students can access learning resources.

Reason: During the visit the visitors were shown the range of learning resources available to students including the library and the online resources. The visitors were satisfied that the resources will effectively support the learning and teaching activities of the programme and that the standard was met. However when meeting with the students they expressed a concern that at times certain core textbooks were unavailable due to high demand. This issue was raised with the programme team who stated that students are able to request digitised copies of chapters when certain books are in high demand. As such the visitors could see that the arrangements were in place to ensure that the learning resources effectively supported the required learning and teaching activities of the programme, especially in times of high demand. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider consider how they communicate the ways in which students can access certain learning resources, including digitised chapters.

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

Recommendation: It is recommend that the education provider considers expanding their involvement of service users to ensure that involvement is consistent across the programmes.

Reason: At the visit the visitors met with two service users and carers and students to discuss the involvement of service users and carers in the programme. When meeting with students they stated that they had some involvement with service users across the programme including seminars, teaching and in the admissions process. However the experience of interaction with service users was inconsistent as some groups had varied interaction. When meeting with the service users there were two individuals who are involved with the programme in various roles. Therefore, the visitors were satisfied that service users and carers are involved in the programme and that they are suitably supported and trained. However the visitors noted that there were only two service users involved in what will be five cohorts of students a year. The programme team stated that there have been times where a service user has fallen ill and the sessions were cancelled. Considering the information provided the visitors were satisfied that the standard is met and that service users are involved in the programme, however they noted a risk that as the programme grows, the involvement of service users may become increasingly inconsistent. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider consider expanding the pool of service users and carers they involve on the programme to ensure that the involvement remains consistent across the programmes.

Vicki Lawson-Brown
Joanna Goodwin
Mohammed Jeewa

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time accelerated
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	14 – 15 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 'art therapist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 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 25 May 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 2 May 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 25 May 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 reviewed 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	Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker in England) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Mohammed Jeewa (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2017
Chair	Day 1: David Beresford (University of Derby) Day 2: Mark Wainman (University of Derby)
Secretary	Chloe Jones (University of Derby)
Members of the joint panel	Jan Jensen (College of Occupational Therapists) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational Therapists) Carol Mytton (College of Occupational Therapists) Jo-Drummond-Child (Internal panel member) Sarah Barley-McMullen (Internal panel member) Fiona Douglas (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 from the last two years 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 BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy Full time and MSc Occupational Therapy Full time programmes, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining one SET.

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

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

Condition: The education provider is required to revise the assessment regulations to ensure that they clearly specify that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility for admission to the register.

Reason: When reviewing the assessment regulations the visitors noted that there was no specific regulation regarding an aegrotat award. The visitors noted that the assessment regulations stated that only the named awards would provide eligibility to the register, however it was not clear whether an aegrotat award is available or whether an aegrotat award would provide admission to the register. At the visit the programme team stated that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility to apply to the register. Therefore without this requirement being clearly articulated in the assessment regulations, the visitors could not determine the requirements for an aegrotat award and therefore require further evidence to demonstrate the requirements ensuring that the standard is met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: It is recommended that the education provider take steps to further communicate the ways in which students can access learning resources.

Reason: During the visit the visitors were shown the range of learning resources available to students including the library and the online resources. The visitors were satisfied that the resources will effectively support the learning and teaching activities of the programme and that the standard was met. However when meeting with the students they expressed a concern that at times certain core textbooks were unavailable due to high demand. This issue was raised with the programme team who stated that students are able to request digitised copies of chapters when certain books are in high demand. As such the visitors could see that the arrangements were in place to ensure that the learning resources effectively supported the required learning and teaching activities of the programme, especially in times of high demand. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider consider how they communicate the ways in which students can access certain learning resources, including digitised chapters.

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

Recommendation: It is recommend that the education provider considers expanding their involvement of service users to ensure that involvement is consistent across the programmes.

Reason: At the visit the visitors met with two service users and carers and students to discuss the involvement of service users and carers in the programme. When meeting with students they stated that they had some involvement with service users across the programme including seminars, teaching and in the admissions process. However the experience of interaction with service users was inconsistent as some groups had varied interaction. When meeting with the service users there were two individuals who are involved with the programme in various roles. Therefore, the visitors were satisfied that service users and carers are involved in the programme and that they are suitably supported and trained. However the visitors noted that there were only two service users involved in what will be five cohorts of students a year. The programme team stated that there have been times where a service user has fallen ill and the sessions were cancelled. Considering the information provided the visitors were satisfied that the standard is met and that service users are involved in the programme, however they noted a risk that as the programme grows, the involvement of service users may become increasingly inconsistent. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider consider expanding the pool of service users and carers they involve on the programme to ensure that the involvement remains consistent across the programmes.

<div align="right">
Vicki Lawson-Brown
Joanna Goodwin
Mohammed Jeewa
</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme name	PG Dip Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	14 – 15 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 'occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 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 25 May 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 2 May 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 25 May 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 reviewed 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	Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker in England) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Mohammed Jeewa (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2017
Chair	Day 1: David Beresford (University of Derby) Day 2: Mark Wainman (University of Derby)
Secretary	Chloe Jones (University of Derby)
Members of the joint panel	Jan Jensen (College of Occupational Therapists) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational Therapists) Carol Mytton (College of Occupational Therapists) Jo-Drummond-Child (Internal panel member) Sarah Barley-McMullen (Internal panel member) Fiona Douglas (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 from the last two years 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 BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy Full time and MSc Occupational Therapy Full time programmes, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining one SET.

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

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

Condition: The education provider is required to revise the assessment regulations to ensure that they clearly specify that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility for admission to the register.

Reason: When reviewing the assessment regulations the visitors noted that there was no specific regulation regarding an aegrotat award. The visitors noted that the assessment regulations stated that only the named awards would provide eligibility to the register, however it was not clear whether an aegrotat award is available or whether an aegrotat award would provide admission to the register. At the visit the programme team stated that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility to apply to the register. Therefore without this requirement being clearly articulated in the assessment regulations, the visitors could not determine the requirements for an aegrotat award and therefore require further evidence to demonstrate the requirements ensuring that the standard is met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: It is recommended that the education provider take steps to further communicate the ways in which students can access learning resources.

Reason: During the visit the visitors were shown the range of learning resources available to students including the library and the online resources. The visitors were satisfied that the resources will effectively support the learning and teaching activities of the programme and that the standard was met. However when meeting with the students they expressed a concern that at times certain core textbooks were unavailable due to high demand. This issue was raised with the programme team who stated that students are able to request digitised copies of chapters when certain books are in high demand. As such the visitors could see that the arrangements were in place to ensure that the learning resources effectively supported the required learning and teaching activities of the programme, especially in times of high demand. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider consider how they communicate the ways in which students can access certain learning resources, including digitised chapters.

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

Recommendation: It is recommend that the education provider considers expanding their involvement of service users to ensure that involvement is consistent across the programmes.

Reason: At the visit the visitors met with two service users and carers and students to discuss the involvement of service users and carers in the programme. When meeting with students they stated that they had some involvement with service users across the programme including seminars, teaching and in the admissions process. However the experience of interaction with service users was inconsistent as some groups had varied interaction. When meeting with the service users there were two individuals who are involved with the programme in various roles. Therefore, the visitors were satisfied that service users and carers are involved in the programme and that they are suitably supported and trained. However the visitors noted that there were only two service users involved in what will be five cohorts of students a year. The programme team stated that there have been times where a service user has fallen ill and the sessions were cancelled. Considering the information provided the visitors were satisfied that the standard is met and that service users are involved in the programme, however they noted a risk that as the programme grows, the involvement of service users may become increasingly inconsistent. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider consider expanding the pool of service users and carers they involve on the programme to ensure that the involvement remains consistent across the programmes.

<div align="right">

Vicki Lawson-Brown
Joanna Goodwin
Mohammed Jeewa

</div>

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Keele University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality / domain	Diagnostic radiographer
Date of visit	25-26 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 'radiographer' or 'diagnostic radiographer' 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 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 22 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.

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) Prisha Shah (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2017
Chair	Steven Shardlow (Keele University)
Secretary	Claire Evans (Keele University)
Members of the joint panel	Louise Coleman (Society and College of Radiographers) Richard Price (Society and College of Radiographers)

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 School of Health and Rehabilitation 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 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining six SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the information they give to applicants, to ensure that they have the information they need regarding who will be responsible for paying the fees for the programme.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the admissions policy, open day slides, programme specification and programme website, which provided information about the programme for potential applicants. In the programme specification, open day slides and on the website it is clear that students have to pay for this programme themselves and this was confirmed at the visit. However on page 1 of the admissions policy it states that "NHS funded places on the Radiography programme at Keele University are commissioned by the West Midlands Strategic Health Authority". The visitors noted that the inconsistent information regarding funding for the programme could be misleading to potential applicants. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider ensures that the materials available to potential applicants gives these applicants the information they require, in order to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide clarity on the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) requirements for this programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the UG Radiography Admissions Policy. This policy states that "an applicant whose first language is not English will have to demonstrate competence by holding an internationally recognised English language qualification". The visitors were satisfied with this statement. However, the visitors noted in the documentation that a level 7 in the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) must 'usually' be achieved before being admitted onto the programme. During the meeting with the programme team, the visitors asked what circumstances students will not 'usually' need to achieve a level 7. The programme team told the visitors that students will have to achieve a level 7 in the IELTS before admission onto the programme. The visitors therefore note that the terminology used in the admissions documentation could be misleading as it suggests that students may not have to achieve a level 7 in some circumstances. The visitors therefore require evidence which demonstrates how the education provider clarifies what the IELTS requirements are for this programme, so that applicants know what is required of them during the admissions process.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate where standard of proficiency (SOP) 2.6, regarding the current legislation governing the use of ionising and non-ionising radiation will be taught as part of the curriculum.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the Course Specific Regulations and Module Proposal Documentation. From a review of the documentation the visitors were unable to locate, where in the curriculum SOP 2.6, the ability to "practise in accordance with the current legislation governing the use of ionising and non-ionising radiation got medical and other purposes' is addressed in the curriculum. The visitors noted that as part of the competencies needed to be achieved by students on placements, students must be able to "practice in accordance with the relevant ionising radiation regulations". The visitors could not however locate where in the curriculum students will be taught about the ionising radiation regulations such as the Ionising Radiation (Medical Exposure) Regulations (IR(ME)R) 2000 and its amendments (2006 and 2011), as part of the programme. As such the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how students will be taught about the ionising radiation regulations to enable them to meet the standards of proficiency for radiographers.

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

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

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the practice experience handbook, programme specification, student handbook, partnership/service level agreement and were shown the placement audit and monitoring database at the visit. From the initial documents submitted, the visitors could not see how the education provider approves placements prior to students going on them and how they are monitored. At the visit, the visitors were shown the placement audit and monitoring database and the visitors were satisfied that there was a process whereby placements were appropriately monitored, as there were effective feedback mechanisms from all stakeholders in place. However, the visitors were still unclear on how placements are approved before students go on them. In the placement audit form, the visitors could not locate any information regarding what policies and processes there were for approving placements and how these policies and processes are put into practice. The visitors were not satisfied that the placement audit tool was a sufficient process to approve placements prior to students going on that placement as it did not include any policies and processes for approving the placements. Therefore the visitors could not determine that there are effective policies and processes in place to approve placements. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the overarching policies, systems and procedures in place regarding the approval of placements to ensure this standard is met.

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

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

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the practice experience handbook, student handbook and programme specification. During the programme team meeting the visitors were told that placements are audited before students are placed, and the visitors were then shown an audit form for placements at the visit.

However, after scrutinising the evidence, the visitors could not see how the criteria against which placements will be audited will ensure that the practice placement settings will have equality and diversity policies that will be effectively implemented and monitored. The visitors noted that the audit tool did not include any information regarding where the placement provider equality and diversity policies will be recorded. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how the education provider would be able to make judgements about whether the placement providers has equality and diversity policies in place and how they ensure that these policies are appropriate. The visitors will therefore need to see further evidence of policies and procedures in place to demonstrate how they ensure that all placements ensure that equality and diversity policies in relation to students are in place and appropriate.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is from a relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the 'general regulations for university examinations and assessment' and the 'Keele code of practice on external examining'. There was no information in the 'general regulations for university examinations and assessment' which specifies that the external examiner will be from a relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. Furthermore, in the 'Keele code of practice on external examining' it states that external examiners must meet "applicable criteria set out by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies." However, the visitors could not be certain from this evidence that this would mean that the HCPC standard would be met as it is not defined in the assessment regulations as to whether the external examiners would have to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register and, if not, that there is an appropriate reason for appointing an examiner who is not from the relevant part of the Register. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations for this programme specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is from a relevant part of the HCPC Register, and, if not, that there is an appropriate reason for appointing an examiner who is not from the relevant part of the Register.

Linda Mutema
Marin Benwell
Prisha Shah

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
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 'physiotherapist' 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 9 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 25 May 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 3 May 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 25 May 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 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	Deirdre Keane (Lay visitor) Pamela Bagley (Physiotherapist) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	40 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2017
Chair	Darren James (London South Bank University)
Secretary	Ian Govender (London South Bank University)
Members of the joint panel	Liz Hancock (Charted Society of Physiotherapy) Nina Paterson (Charted Society of Physiotherapy) Isabella Saprong (Charted Society of Physiotherapy) Jacqueline Mullan (External panel member) Sheelagh Mealing (Intenral panel member) Sally Skillett-Moore (Internal panel member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
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 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 BSc Physiotherapy and Nursing programmes, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining one SET.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

6.2 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.

Condition: Review the programme outcomes to ensure that they comply with the expectations of a level six programme.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were made aware that the programme team had mapped the learning outcomes for the programme to the Framework for Higher Education Qualification (FHEQ). In reviewing the programme specification the visitors noted the course outcomes. However, the visitors were unclear as to how some of the course outcomes meet the requirements of the FHEQ in determining what a student must meet in the final year of a bachelors level programme, level 6. For example outcome B1, which states that to be successful students must be able to "Memorise and assimilate new knowledge…", the visitors understand to be equivalent to assessment and achievement at level 4, the first year of a bachelors programme. As such the visitors could not determine how the programme team have mapped their assessment requirements and course outcomes to the FHEQ and how the achievement of these outcomes would ensure that a student has achieved what is required at level 6. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team used to map the course outcomes to the FHEQ and further evidence of when and where in the programme students will be expected to meet the course outcomes.

Deirdre Keane
Pamela Bagley
Anthony Power

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
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 'physiotherapist' 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 9 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 25 May 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 3 May 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 25 May 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 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	Deirdre Keane (Lay visitor) Pamela Bagley (Physiotherapist) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2018
Chair	Darren James (London South Bank University)
Secretary	Ian Govender (London South Bank University)
Members of the joint panel	Liz Hancock (Charted Society of Physiotherapy) Nina Paterson (Charted Society of Physiotherapy) Isabella Saprong (Charted Society of Physiotherapy) Jacqueline Mullan (External panel member) Sheelagh Mealing (Intenral panel member) Sally Skillett-Moore (Internal panel member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
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 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 BSc Physiotherapy and Nursing programmes, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining one SET.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

6.2 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.

Condition: Explain and rationalise the process by which the programme complies with the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Benchmark statement for physiotherapists, and has been used to generate the overall course outcomes.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were made aware that the programme team had mapped the learning outcomes for the programme to the QAA benchmark statement for physiotherapists. They also noted that the overall course outcomes were included in the programme specification, which referenced the course outcomes for this programme as well as the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme. In reviewing this document noted that the BSc (Hons) course outcome C1 articulated clearly what students would need to achieve to meet this outcome, which in turn demonstrated how QAA benchmark standards A2 and A3 would be met. However, they noted that for the masters level course outcomes, the outcome for C1 did not articulate what was expected in as much depth. As such the visitors were unclear how students on this programme who met this course outcome would also be meeting QAA benchmark standards A2 and A3. Because of this the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensures that the course outcomes for this programme comply with the QAA benchmark statement for physiotherapists. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of what process the programme team had used to ensure that the course outcomes comply with the QAA benchmark statement and how they will ensure continuing compliance in the future.

Deirdre Keane
Pamela Bagley
Anthony Power

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme name	Integrated Masters in Physiotherapy – MPhysio
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
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 'physiotherapist' 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 9 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 25 May 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 3 May 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 25 May 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 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	Deirdre Keane (Lay visitor) Pamela Bagley (Physiotherapist) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	20 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2017
Chair	Darren James (London South Bank University)
Secretary	Ian Govender (London South Bank University)
Members of the joint panel	Liz Hancock (Charted Society of Physiotherapy) Nina Paterson (Charted Society of Physiotherapy) Isabella Saprong (Charted Society of Physiotherapy) Jacqueline Mullan (External panel member) Sheelagh Mealing (Intenral panel member) Sally Skillett-Moore (Internal panel member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
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 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 BSc Physiotherapy and Nursing programmes, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining one SET.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

6.2 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.

Condition: Explain and rationalise the process by which the programme complies with the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Benchmark statement for physiotherapists, and has been used to generate the overall course outcomes.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were made aware that the programme team had mapped the learning outcomes for the programme to the QAA benchmark statement for physiotherapists. They also noted that the overall course outcomes were included in the programme specification, which referenced the course outcomes for this programme as well as the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme. In reviewing this document noted that the BSc (Hons) course outcome C1 articulated clearly what students would need to achieve to meet this outcome, which in turn demonstrated how QAA benchmark standards A2 and A3 would be met. However, they noted that for the masters level course outcomes, the outcome for C1 did not articulate what was expected in as much depth. As such the visitors were unclear how students on this programme who met this course outcome would also be meeting QAA benchmark standards A2 and A3. Because of this the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensures that the course outcomes for this programme comply with the QAA benchmark statement for physiotherapists. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of what process the programme team had used to ensure that the course outcomes comply with the QAA benchmark statement and how they will ensure continuing compliance in the future.

Deirdre Keane
Pamela Bagley
Anthony Power

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Manchester
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Speech and language therapist
Date of visit	9 – 10 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 'speech and language therapist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 April 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 25 May 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 9 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 was to reduce the length of the programme from four years to three, and affected the following standards – programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was an HCPC only visit. At the visit, the education provider did not validate or review the programmes, and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The professional body undertook a paper based exercise to review the programme, and the report from this exercise was made available to the visitors. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the 'Masters in Speech and Language Therapy' programme, which is a four year Integrated Masters programme, which shares delivery with the BSc (Hons) programme for the first three years. A separate visitor report exists for this programme.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elspeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist)
	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist)
	Kathleen Taylor (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Jamie Hunt
Proposed maximum student numbers	42 per cohort, 1 cohort per year, with up to 42 continuing onto the Integrated Masters fourth year
First approved intake	1 September 2000
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2017
Chair	Shaun Speed (University of Manchester)
Secretary	Wayne Bulbrook (University of Manchester)

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 visitors considered external examiners reports for the BSc (Hons) programme only, as the Integrated Masters has not yet run.

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 existing BSc (Hons) programme, as the Integrated Masters programme currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 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 two recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must update their programme and advertising documentation to ensure that information available to prospective and current students about personal and professional liability is accurate.

Reason: From reviewing the documentation, the visitors noted that the information available for students about personal and professional indemnity could be misleading. In the student clinical handbook (page 16), the education provider notes that "[p]ersonal injury to students is not covered by the university's policy", unless the placement provider was "negligent", and suggests that students take out "personal accident cover". This document also suggests that students become student members of the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (RCSLT) who provide "professional indemnity insurance [for students] when on placement." Both statements could be misleading to students, as they will likely be covered by vicarious (in the employer setting, or when under direct supervision of a registered speech and language therapist) and public liability insurance, and therefore will not need to take out any other liability cover in most circumstances. Particularly, the statement about RCSLT cover suggests that without student membership, students will not be covered. The visitors therefore require the education provider to check the accuracy of these statements in light of vicarious and public liability cover, and update their documentation as required.

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

Condition: The education provider must obtain consent from students when they participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: From reviewing the SETs mapping completed by the education provider, the visitors noted that this standard was marked as "NA". However, from conversations at the visit, the visitors noted that students do participate in role play sessions when undertaking the programme, and that therefore this standard does apply. Students noted that they had not given their consent to participate in these sessions, but considered them mandatory parts of the programme, and were happy to undertake them. However, the visitors noted that the education provider must have a protocol to obtain consent from students undertaking these sessions, to mitigate against any risks to the students or for the education provider, and ultimately to ensure this standard is met. Therefore the education provider must ensure that there is a protocol in place to obtain consent from students who undertake role play sessions.

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 demonstrate how the level of attendance required for practice placements is appropriate, and update their programme documentation so it accurately reflects this requirement.

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors noted that there is a 100 per cent attendance requirement for practice placements. However, from discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that there is some tolerance in this requirement for a certain level of unavoidable absence. However, the visitors were unclear what constitutes an acceptable level of absence, why this level is acceptable, and therefore how the education provider ensures that students undertake an appropriate amount of practice placements. The visitors were also unclear how staff and students are made aware of this (currently informal) policy, as this is not reflected in the programme documentation, and are therefore unclear how it is consistently applied. Therefore, the visitors require that the education provider defines what level of absence is acceptable, demonstrates why this is the case, and documents this policy so it can be accessed by staff that will be applying it, and students on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the programme documentation clearly defines options for alternative assessment should service users not give consent to be filmed as part of assessment on placement.

Reason: At the approval visit, the students told the visitors that they would fail a practice placement and need to retake it, if they were unable to have an assessment with a service user filmed. The programme team told the visitors that this was not the case, and that if no service user consented to being filmed, other arrangements would be made to assess the student. The visitors were satisfied with these arrangements from their discussions. However, on reviewing the documentation, the visitors noted (from page 10 of the Student Clinical Handbook) that there is an "Automatic fail if no video is submitted", and that "If [the placement is] failed [students] will need either a re-sit placement and a new clinical presentation examination or a re-sit of the original presentation without a re-sit placement". The visitors were not clear in which circumstances a repeat of placement would be required, and considered that this information could be interpreted by staff and students in different ways. Therefore, the visitors require that the education provider updates their documentation to ensure clarity about what would happen if students were unable to have an assessment with a service user filmed.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform the HCPC their planned recruitment changes, or if staffing levels are reduced in the future.

Reason: From reviewing the documentation, and from conversations with the senior team, the visitors noted that the current number of staff (including 2.0 FTE vacancies) is appropriate to support the delivery of the programme, and therefore that this standard is met. The visitors noted that the education provider is currently recruiting for one of the FTE vacancies, and that they had plans to recruit either another FTE or 1.4 FTEs in the future. Although the staff numbers and profile is currently appropriate to support the delivery of the programme, the visitors note that there is a risk to the second FTE (or 1.4 FTE) role not being recruited to, and therefore the staff numbers and profile could not be appropriate in the longer term. Therefore, the visitors recommend that the education provider inform the HCPC of any changes to their planned recruitment, or to the numbers of programme staff more broadly.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue their work to ensure resources in the programme's resource room are always available to students.

Reason: On the facilities tour, the visitors were shown the programme's resource room, and were told that these resources should always be available as they should not be removed from the room. However, they were also told by staff and students, that there are sometimes issues with resources being taken and not returned. This has resulted in some students not being able to access certain resources at certain times. The education provider has attempted to manage this issue, by:
- making the room only accessible by a code given to their SLT students;
- employing a student to stocktake and manage a list of missing resources; and
- putting up signage that notes resources should not be removed.

The visitors were satisfied that resources in this room were appropriate to the curriculum and were usually available for students as required. They also noted that the education provider is working to reduce the impact of this issue on students, and are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors note that in addition to the potential issue with students not being able to access specific resources, there is also a risk of inappropriate use of the resources by students in unsupervised settings. Therefore the education provider should continue its work in this area to ensure that all resources are readily available to students, and to mitigate the risk of these resources being used inappropriately.

Elspeth McCartney
Caroline Sykes
Kathleen Taylor

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Manchester
Programme name	Masters in Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Speech and language therapist
Date of visit	9 – 10 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 'speech and language therapist' 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 21 April 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 25 May 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 9 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 an HCPC only visit. At the visit, the education provider did not validate or review the programmes, and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The professional body undertook a paper based exercise to review the programme, and the report from this exercise was made available to the visitors. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy programme run by the education provider, which is completed by all students undertaking this Masters programme, making it an 'Integrated Masters'. A separate visitor report exists for the BSc (Hons) programme.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elspeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist) Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) Kathleen Taylor (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Jamie Hunt
Proposed maximum student numbers	42 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2017
Chair	Shaun Speed (University of Manchester)
Secretary	Wayne Bulbrook (University of Manchester)

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 visitors considered external examiners reports for the BSc (Hons) programme only, as the Integrated Masters has not yet run.

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 existing BSc (Hons) programme, as the Integrated Masters programme currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five SETs.

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

The visitors have also made two 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 update their programme and advertising documentation to ensure that information available to prospective and current students about personal and professional liability is accurate.

Reason: From reviewing the documentation, the visitors noted that the information available for students about personal and professional indemnity could be misleading. In the student clinical handbook (page 16), the education provider notes that "[p]ersonal injury to students is not covered by the university's policy", unless the placement provider was "negligent", and suggests that students take out "personal accident cover". This document also suggests that students become student members of the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (RCSLT) who provide "professional indemnity insurance [for students] when on placement." Both statements could be misleading to students, as they will likely be covered by vicarious (in the employer setting, or when under direct supervision of a registered speech and language therapist) and public liability insurance, and therefore will not need to take out any other liability cover in most circumstances. Particularly, the statement about RCSLT cover suggests that without student membership, students will not be covered. The visitors therefore require the education provider to check the accuracy of these statements in light of vicarious and public liability cover, and update their documentation as required.

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

Condition: The education provider must obtain consent from students when they participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: From reviewing the SETs mapping completed by the education provider, the visitors noted that this standard was marked as "NA". However, from conversations at the visit, the visitors noted that students do participate in role play sessions when undertaking the programme, and that therefore this standard does apply. Students noted that they had not given their consent to participate in these sessions, but considered them mandatory parts of the programme, and were happy to undertake them. However, the visitors noted that the education provider must have a protocol to obtain consent from students undertaking these sessions, to mitigate against any risks to the students or for the education provider, and ultimately to ensure this standard is met. Therefore the education provider must ensure that there is a protocol in place to obtain consent from students who undertake role play sessions.

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 demonstrate how the level of attendance required for practice placements is appropriate, and update their programme documentation so it accurately reflects this requirement.

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors noted that there is a 100 per cent attendance requirement for practice placements. However, from discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that there is some tolerance in this requirement for a certain level of unavoidable absence. However, the visitors were unclear what constitutes an acceptable level of absence, why this level is acceptable, and therefore how the education provider ensures that students undertake an appropriate amount of practice placements. The visitors were also unclear how staff and students are made aware of this (currently informal) policy, as this is not reflected in the programme documentation, and are therefore unclear how it is consistently applied. Therefore, the visitors require that the education provider defines what level of absence is acceptable, demonstrates why this is the case, and documents this policy so it can be accessed by staff that will be applying it, and students on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must update their documentation to ensure that they are able to provide an alternative non-qualifying award should prohibitive professional issues be identified during the Integrated Masters year.

Reason: From conversations with the programme team, the visitors noted that if there were issues identified during the Integrated Masters (IM) part of the programme that impacted on an individual's fitness to practise, that individual would not receive an award that would allow them to apply for registration with the HCPC. This was the case even though all students undertaking the IM must have completed all components of an approved programme (the BSc (Hons)), in order to progress to this further level of study, although they would not be given this qualification before progressing to the IM. However, the visitors noted that there is a statement in the programme handbook (page 21) that "[a] student on the MSLT pathway who is in their fourth and final year but unable to progress to the award of Masters Speech and Language Therapy, may exit with the BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy as the clinical award with eligibility to apply to the HCPC for registration to practice, as they will have already achieved this by the end of their third year." The visitors noted that this statement does not explicitly assert that the education provider will not give this award should an issue occur during the IM year that would impede a student's fitness to practice as a speech and language therapist. Therefore, the education provider should update this document, along with any other relevant documentation, to reflect their intention in this area.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the programme documentation clearly defines options for alternative assessment should service users not give consent to be filmed as part of assessment on placement.

Reason: At the approval visit, the students told the visitors that they would fail a practice placement and need to retake it, if they were unable to have an assessment with a service user filmed. The programme team told the visitors that this was not the case, and that if no service user consented to being filmed, other arrangements would be made to assess the student. The visitors were satisfied with these arrangements from their discussions. However, on reviewing the documentation, the visitors noted (from page 10 of the Student Clinical Handbook) that there is an "Automatic fail if no

video is submitted", and that "If [the placement is] failed [students] will need either a re-sit placement and a new clinical presentation examination or a re-sit of the original presentation without a re-sit placement". The visitors were not clear in which circumstances a repeat of placement would be required, and considered that this information could be interpreted by staff and students in different ways. Therefore, the visitors require that the education provider updates their documentation to ensure clarity about what would happen if students were unable to have an assessment with a service user filmed.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform the HCPC their planned recruitment changes, or if staffing levels are reduced in the future.

Reason: From reviewing the documentation, and from conversations with the senior team, the visitors noted that the current number of staff (including 2.0 FTE vacancies) is appropriate to support the delivery of the programme, and therefore that this standard is met. The visitors noted that the education provider is currently recruiting for one of the FTE vacancies, and that they had plans to recruit either another FTE or 1.4 FTEs in the future. Although the staff numbers and profile is currently appropriate to support the delivery of the programme, the visitors note that there is a risk to the second FTE (or 1.4 FTE) role not being recruited to, and therefore the staff numbers and profile could not be appropriate in the longer term. Therefore, the visitors recommend that the education provider inform the HCPC of any changes to their planned recruitment, or to the numbers of programme staff more broadly.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue their work to ensure resources in the programme's resource room are always available to students.

Reason: On the facilities tour, the visitors were shown the programme's resource room, and were told that these resources should always be available as they should not be removed from the room. However, they were also told by staff and students, that there are sometimes issues with resources being taken and not returned. This has resulted in some students not being able to access certain resources at certain times. The education provider has attempted to manage this issue, by:
- making the room only accessible by a code given to their SLT students;
- employing a student to stocktake and manage a list of missing resources; and
- putting up signage that notes resources should not be removed.

The visitors were satisfied that resources in this room were appropriate to the curriculum and were usually available for students as required. They also noted that the education provider is working to reduce the impact of this issue on students, and are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors note that in addition to the potential issue with students not being able to access specific resources, there is also a risk of inappropriate use of the resources by students in unsupervised settings. Therefore the education provider should continue its work in this area to ensure that all resources are readily available to students, and to mitigate the risk of these resources being used inappropriately.

Elspeth McCartney
Caroline Sykes
Kathleen Taylor

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	7 – 8 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 'paramedic' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 24 April 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 25 May 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 17 May 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 8 June 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 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	David Whitmore (Paramedic) Paul Bates (Paramedic) Joanne Watchman (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Proposed student numbers	70 per cohort, 2 cohorts per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2017
Chair	Connor Moss (Sheffield Hallam University)
Secretary	Helen Garner (Sheffield Hallam University)
Members of the joint panel	Shawna McCoy (Internal Panel Member) David Lomas (internal Panel Member) Paul Vigar (College of Paramedics) Vince Clarke (College of Paramedics)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
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 examiner reports 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 Paramedic Practice programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information to clarify the entry requirements for the programme.

Reason: In the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted that there were inconsistencies in the information regarding the admissions requirements provided to potential applicants. The visitors noted in the programme specification (page 21) and on the programme website that as part of the entry requirements applicants need "five GCSEs at grade C or grade 4 or above, including English language or literature, mathematics and a science (single or double) or equivalent". However, in open day presentation, it states that applicants need "three GCSEs at grade C or above, including English language or literature, mathematics, science (single or double) or equivalent". Furthermore the visitors noted in the open day information and website material submitted prior to the visit that applicants must "have a full, clean driving licence by the time they attend their interview". However the education provider highlighted in the programme specification that "a driving license is not a condition of acceptance on the programme", and this was confirmed by the programme team at the visit. The visitors also noted various other inconsistencies in the advertising material. The visitors therefore, require the programme team to revise all documentation including advertising material to clearly articulate the information to potential applicants and the education provider in order to enable them to make an informed choice of whether to take up or make an offer of a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to ensure that it is up to date.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included instances of outdated information. For example, on the programme website it states that the modules for the programme are "currently being redesigned". At the visit the programme team mentioned that the modules have now been redesigned, as they were being redesigned for the approval visit. The visitors therefore require the documentation to be revised to ensure that the information communicated to students is up to date. This way the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available to support students' learning are being effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that practice placement educators from non-ambulance settings undertake appropriate practice placement educator training in order to appropriately supervise students from this programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the student handbook, practice educator handbook, support for educators and Yorkshire (YAS) and East Midlands Ambulance service (EMAS) training material websites. The visitors were clear from the documentation and at the visit that the majority of placements will be with YAS and EMAS. The visitors were also clear that YAS and EMAS offer their own practice placement educator training and that through the education provider's auditing process the training offered to practice educators by these ambulance services were appropriate. During the practice placement educator (all practice educators were from either YAS or EMAS) and programme team meeting the visitors were told that the practice educators receive a lot of support from the education provider. The visitors were therefore satisfied that practice placement educators from the two ambulance services undertook appropriate practice placement educator training and were effectively supported to undertake their roles. However, the visitors were not provided with any information regarding training for practice placement educators in non-ambulance settings. As such the visitors could not see how the education provider has processes in place to ensure that placement educators in non-ambulance settings undertake appropriate practice placement educator training, and require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is met.

David Whitmore
Paul Bates
Joanne Watchman

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme name	PGCert Approved Mental Health Professional
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Type of programme	Approved mental health professional
Date of visit	21 – 22 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 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 or have an annotation on their Registration record, the HCPC also approve a small number of programmes which are not linked to HCPC Registration. These programmes are for the profession of approved mental health practitioners (AMHPs) (for social workers, mental health and learning disabilities nurses, occupational therapists and practitioner psychologists).

The HCPC criteria for approving AMHP programmes set out the systems and processes an education provider is expected to have in place to deliver an AMHP programme, as well as the competencies professionals must achieve on completing the programme.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 10 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 25 May 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 17 May 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 8 June 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 criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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 criteria for approving approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Abrahart (Approved mental health professional) Dorothy Smith (Approved mental health professional) Ian Hughes (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Proposed student numbers	Full time -15 per cohort, one cohort per year Part time - 5 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2017
Chair	Philip Millington (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Secretary	Lisa Connors (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Members of the joint panel	Dagmar Steffens (Internal Panel Member) Philip Watson (Internal Panel Member) Ruth Heames (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the criteria for approving AMHP programmes	☒	☐	☐
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 two year ago prior to the visit as there are currently no external examiners 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 Best Interest Assessors (BIA) and BSc (Hons) Social work programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals

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 46 of the criteria have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three criteria.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The education provider must revise their admissions material to ensure the length of the programme is accurately stated.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that length of the programme will be four months. This was confirmed by the programme team at the visit. However the visitors noted that the website for the programme states the programme length will be six months. The visitors note that the programme length is an important factor in applicants being able to make an informed decision about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme. The visitors therefore require evidence that clearly states the duration of the programme, and how this will be effectively communicated to applicants.

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

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

Reason: To evidence this criterion the visitors were directed to the placement learning opportunity profile, the placement agreement form, and were shown the placement monitoring database, (ARC) at the visit. The placement learning opportunity profile is a questionnaire that potential practice placement providers complete. Additionally, as part of the quality assurance measures for placements, the education provider ensures that there is a formal practice placement agreement between the students and the practice placement providers that must be completed at the beginning of the placement. The visitors were also told that all placements are visited prior to students undertaking that placement. The visitors agreed that the placement agreement form and the storage of the placement information on the ARC database are effective processes for monitoring placements.

However, the visitors noted that although there is a process in place for monitoring all placements, the visitors were not clear how the education provider ensures that placements are effectively audited prior to students undertaking those placements. The visitors were not satisfied that the placement opportunity profile was a sufficient process to approve placements prior to students going on that placement as it was a placement opportunity questionnaire rather than an audit. Furthermore, the visitors did not receive any information regarding what formal criteria is checked when the placement is visited by a member of staff from the education provider. Therefore the visitors could not determine that there are effective policies and processes in place to approve placements. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the overarching policies, systems and procedures in place regarding the approval of placements to ensure this criterion is met.

D.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how students are fully prepared for placement, including clarity around the roles and responsibilities of practice placement educators.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted multiple references to a variety of practice placement educator titles, specifically 'Approved Mental Health Practice Educators', 'Practice supervisors', 'AMHP supervisor', 'Practice assessor' and 'AMHP Leads'. Prior to the visit the visitors could not determine if these were different roles. At the visit, the visitors were told during the practice educator and programme team meeting that all these were essentially the same role. However, the visitors were still unclear as to whether there was a variety of practice placement educators with a range of titles and / or responsibilities as it was not reflected in the documentation. As such the visitors note that there was a potential risk that students would not understand the roles and lines of responsibility of the practice placement educators. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which clearly outlines the roles and responsibilities of the various practice placement educators noted in the documentation and how this information is provided clearly and consistently to students.

D.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The programme team must revise the programme documentation to ensure that students are fully prepared for placements, including information about the duration of placements.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included inconsistent information regarding the duration of placements. On the programme website it states that there are 40 placement days and at the visit the programme team told the visitors that there will be 40 placement days. The visitors were satisfied that the amount of placement days is appropriate for the programme. However, in the programme timetable the visitors noted that there will be

50 placement days. The visitors therefore require the documentation to be revised to ensure that the placement information communicated to students is accurate. In this way, the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available ensures that student are fully prepared for placements

David Abrahart
Dorothy Smith
Ian Hughes