VISITORS' REPORTS

Executive Summary and Recommendations

Introduction
The attached visitors' reports for the following programmes have been sent to the education providers and following a 28 day period no representations have been received. The education providers are in the process of meeting the conditions recommended by the HPC visitors.

Education provider	Programme name	Delivery mode
University of Dundee	Non-Medical Prescribing	Part-time
Edge Hill University	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
University of Northumbria at Newcastle	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	Full-time Part-time
University of Northumbria at Newcastle	MSc Physiotherapy	Full-time
University of Northumbria at Newcastle	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	Full-time Part-time
University of Northumbria at Newcastle	MSc Occupational Therapy	Full-time
University of Northumbria at Newcastle	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
University of Paisley	Non-Medical Prescribing Programming	Part-time
Bangor, University of Wales	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time

Decision
The Panel is asked to –

accept the visitors' report for the above named programmes, including the conditions recommended by the visitors
or
accept the visitors' report for the above named programmes, and vary the conditions recommended by the visitors

Background information
None

Resource implications
None

Financial implications
None

Appendices
Visitors' reports (7)

Date of paper
31 May 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Dundee
Name and titles of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Part time
Date of Visit	26 April 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Jim Pickard, Podiatrist Patricia Fillis, Radiographer
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dr James Newton, Chair Professor Gary Mires Karen Stansfield (NMC) Jennifer Donachie (Secretary) Gill Tooze (Secretary)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☐	☒*	☐
IT facilities	☐	☒*	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☐	☒*	☐

* Note: the Visitors met with Librarian and viewed written summary of library resources. The Visitors also viewed Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) during meetings but did not feel given the content of the programme that a visit to the clinical teaching facilities was required.

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**35 x 2**

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

2.1 The admission procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make, or to take up a place on a programme.

Condition: The course team must revise all documentation (including the Programme Specification, Student Handbooks and Course Fact sheet) to clearly differentiate between levels 9 and 11. This information must address the differences in the teaching and learning strategies and its assessment.

Reason: The programme enables students to be able to undertake level 9 or level 11 study to obtain the same award. The difference between the levels of study and their assessment must be clearly articulated in order for students to be able to make an informed choice about the level of study they wish to undertake.

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria including criminal convictions checks;

Condition: The HEI admissions procedure must make explicit that all applicants must have been subject to a CRB (enhanced disclosure) check.

Reason: The current admission procedure assumes that a student who is currently a registered practitioner will have an up to date CRB check. A system needs to be put in place to ensure that the employer signs that the CRB check has been completed and kept up to date.

2.2.3 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria including compliance with any health requirements

Condition 3: The HEI admissions procedure must make its procedure for ensuring that all applicants have been subject to a positive health check explicit in the documentation.

Reason: The process for ensuring that all entrants to the programme have demonstrated that they have been subject to a positive health check was not evident in the programme specification.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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

Condition: The HEI must document and implement a structured programme to approve, monitor and quality assure all practice placement sites and ensure effective teaching and learning on placement.

Reason: There was no evidence that the HEI had a robust system in place (such as undertaking placements visits or establishing regular, formal correspondence with placement providers) for the adequate monitoring of placements. The HEI cannot rely upon previous good experience, or on the efforts of the student in relation to other education programmes, in determining that the placement is adequate to meet HPC's standards. The HEI also cannot rely on a student's status as an employee with a practice placement provider.

Deadline for conditions to be met:	**22 June 2007**
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval:	**12 June 2007**
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval:	**2 August 2007**

RECOMMENDATIONS

6.7.5 The HEI must ensure that one external examiner of the programme is an AHP from the relevant part of the HPC register.

Condition: That before an external examiner is appointed the course team liaise with the HPC to establish the credentials required to meet HPC standards.

Reason: The programme team currently intends to appoint an external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC register, however the HPC is currently consulting on a change to this standard so before an external examiner is appointed the HEI should check the latest requirements.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The sharing of good practice across all of the HEIs in Scotland through working parties is commended.
2. The individual approach to tailor the teaching and learning to meet the clinical needs of the individual learner is also an example of very good practice.
3. The ongoing work with NES Scotland with regard to e-Learning is commended.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training. We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Jim Pickard
Patricia Fillis

Date: 26 April 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	1st – 2nd May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	**Mr Alan Mount – Professional Lead in ODP & Critical Care – Canterbury Christ Church University** **Mr Nick Clark – Senior Lecturer - HSHS**
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	**Miss Daljit Mahoon**
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	**Ms Wendy Cooke** - (Chair) - Secondary ICT programme leader - Faculty of education - Edge Hill University **Mr Edmund Harrison (secretary) –** Academic Quality Officer **Ms Angela Birchall** - Journalism - Faculty of Arts & Sciences – Edge Hill University **Mr James Caveney –** ODP course director – University of Wales Bangor

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
New Profession	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐

IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**100**

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 2 Programme admissions
2.2.1 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English;

Condition:
The programme team should amend the statement within the admissions criteria which indicates that overseas students require an English IELTS level 7 on entry. This needs to be amended to 6.

Reason:
It is not a requirement for students who do not speak English, on entry to the programme, to have an English language standard of IELTs 7.0. An IELTs level of 6.0 is acceptable providing on completion of the programme the student reaches IELTs 7.0, which is the requirement for them to meet the Standards of Proficiency, requirement under 1.b.4.

Condition 2

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

Condition:
The programme team must review the documentation to include the term 'enhanced' when referring to CRB checks

Reason:
References made within the documentation referring to CRB checks were inconsistent in stating the students will be required to complete an 'enhanced' CRB clearance check. This needs to be clearly stipulated and consistent within the documentation.

Condition 3

2.3 The admission procedures must ensure that the education provider has an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition:
The programme team must submit a clear equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy from the university.

Reason:
The visitors were unable to see clear evidence of an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy from the university. Documentation must be submitted which clearly presents that a policy within the university is in place.

Condition 4

SET 3 Programme Management and Resource Standards
3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition:
The programme team must redraft and submit documentation to include a form utilised to obtain consent from students prior to them participating as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, e.g. role plays, practicing profession-specific techniques.

Reason:
The documentation lacked evidence which insured that this standard is met. A consent mechanism needs to be put in place to ensure that potential candidates are aware of the expectations of the programme regarding the level of participation expected by and from the student.

Condition 5:

SET 4. Curriculum Standards
4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.

Condition:
The programme team must include within the module descriptors reference to HPC, in particular HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics and reference to the HPC website.

Reason:
Within the module descriptors, such as within the list of learning resources, there were no references made to HPC. This should be included so that students are aware of the importance and allocation of HPC information.

Condition 6:

SET 5. Practice placements standards
5.3 The practice placement settings must provide:
5.3.1 a safe environment; and for
5.3.2 safe and effective practice.
5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Condition
The programme team must review and submit an up to date audits for clinical placements.

Reason:
The visitors were unable to view any recent clinical audits at the event which would have enabled them to determine whether the above SETs were being met. An up to date clinical audit would clearly demonstrate the approval and monitoring of placements.

Condition 7

5.8.2 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators are must be appropriately registered.

Condition:
The programme team must review and submit a clear and up to date mentor list which includes mentors registered qualifications.

Reason:
It was difficult to see within the documentation, clear up to date information regarding placement mentor staff, such as who they are and what qualifications they hold. Through the use of a clear mentor list it would enable the visitors to determine whether this SET is bin met.

Condition 8

6.7 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:
6.7.2 for awards which do not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register not to contain any reference to an HPC protected title in their title.

Condition:
The programme team must amend and resubmit the first paragraph within the briefing paper for the validation document to be changed from 'students' who successfully complete the programme will be able to register', it should be 'will be eligible to apply for registration'. This also applies to the paragraph in the validation submission document, section 2.2, page 12.

Reason:
Terminology used within the documentation was misleading for it implied that registration is automatic after the completion of the programme which is incorrect. Students should be made aware that registration is not automatic and that on completion of the programme they will be eligible to apply for registration with HPC.

RECCOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1:

SET 2 Programme admissions
2.2.3 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements

Recommendation:
Encourage the practice to include a follow up on health checks in years 2 and 3.

Reason:
At present students to not have carry out any additional health checks once they are on the programme. An additional screening for health checks would ensure any changes to students' health would be picked up.

Recommendation 2

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Recommendation
The visitors recommend continuing to undertake the intention to appoint the additional members of staff to support the large cohort of students.

Reason:
There should always be an assurance that there is enough staff to deliver the programme effectively, without compromising our standards and that there is an adequate balance between staff and students.

Recommendation 3:

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation:
To ensure that the current resources available at Aintree campus are transferred successfully over to the new site and this is included within the HPC annual monitoring process.

Reason:
It is important for students to continue to have access to resources to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme during and after the move to the new site.

Recommendation 4

SET 4. Curriculum Standards
4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation:
To review the Inter-professional learning within the programme to be more integrated.

Reason
The Visitors were assured that students were exposed to inter-professional learning; however it was not formally integrated within the programme. The visitors' encourage the development of inter-professional learning to be more embedded within the programme.

Recommendation 5:

SET 5. Practice placements standards
5.2 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement.
5.8 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:
5.8.1 must have relevant qualification and experience;
5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation:
To review those current mentors who are currently D32/D33 qualified to be a priority to undertake the full mentor award.

Reason:
Mentors should possess the knowledge, skills and experience to support students and ensure they have a safe environment for effective learning. It would greatly aid those mentors who currently do not possess a mentor award to undertake one, enhancing their skills for this specific role.

Recommendation 6:

SET 6. Assessment standards
6.4 The measurement of student performance and progression must be an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation, and use objective criteria.
6.5 There must be effective mechanisms in place to assure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Recommendation:
To review the making and timely feedback of assignments given to students.

Reason:
In light of students' comments, it was strongly felt that many would have improved in their assignments if they had received feedback of previous assignments earlier.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Mr Alan Mount

Mr Nick Clark

Date: 14th May 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Northumbria University
Name and titles of programme(s)	**BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy** **MSc Physiotherapy**
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	**BSc (Hons) - FT/PT** **MSc - PT**
Date of Visit	**8th & 9th May 2007**
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	**Joanna Jackson - Physiotherapy** **Katie Bosworth - Physiotherapy**
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	**Katherine Lock – Education Officer** **Daljit Mahoon – Education Officer**
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	**Ian Shell** (Chair) - Associate Dean, Learning & Teaching Support, Newcastle Business School **Colin Chandler** - Director of Postgraduate Studies **Helen Smith** - Principal Lecturer, Learning in Organisations **Jim Clark** - Subject Division Leader, Pre and School learning **Jackie Waterfield** - CSP **Nina Thomson** - CSP **Linda Charlton** - Secretary **Colin Keiley -** Team leader A & R, Stockport Health **Stephen Wordsworth** - Head of department, UCE Birmingham **Sarah Johnson -** Occupational therapist , University of Plymouth, HPC Visitor **Bernadette Waters -** Occupational therapist, University of Southampton, HPC Visitor

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☒
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the	☒	☐	☐

programme			
Programme team	⊠	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	⊠	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	⊠	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	⊠	☐	☐
IT facilities	⊠	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	⊠	☐	☐

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**65**

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

> **SET 3. Programme management and resource standards**
> **3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.**
> **3.6 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.**
>
> **Condition**: The programme team are to provide evidence that they have an adequate number of staff by resubmitting documentation to include staffing complement and their current workload with evidence of opportunities for CPD and research
>
> **Reason**: Documentation did not include CVs or the workload of each member on the programme team. It became evident through meeting the programme team and students that the staffing was affecting various aspects of the

programme and there was no evidence supplied to show the potential for staff to engage in staff development opportunities.

Condition 2

SET 4. Curriculum Standards
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.
SET 6 Assessment Standards
6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit documentation to include evidence that by the end of the programme every student is able to meet the standards of proficiency

Reason: The wording in the module descriptors and assessment forms did not make it clear that all the standards of proficiency were being met. There was also no mapping against the learning outcomes of modules to illustrate the relationship between the achievement of learning outcomes and the demonstration of standards of proficiency.

Condition 3

SET 5. Practice placements standards
5.5 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The programme team are to provide evidence that there is the placement capacity to offer the number, range and duration of placements to achieve the learning outcomes

Reason: It became apparent throughout the programme team, student and placement provider meetings that there had been problems in the last academic year with finding enough placements to cover student numbers. Although reassurance was given that this problem had been resolved there was no clear evidence provided about the actual placements and their capacity to support the student numbers as given.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, and IT facilities, including internet access, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Recommendation: The programme team recommended the removal of old editions of publications from the library.

Reason: There seemed to be a number of extremely old texts in the library and it was felt that students could be unaware that they were not the most up to date texts available.

Recommendation 2

SET 4. Curriculum Standards
4.5 The delivery of the programme must assist autonomous and reflective thinking, and evidence based practice.

Recommendation: The programme team are recommended to review and reinforce the use of PPDF

Reason: The planned use of the PPDF is a very positive development. However, previous use of similar tools seemed quite inconsistent across programme teams so it was recommended that sufficient staff development in its use should take place prior to the start of the academic year.

COMMENDATIONS

- **Commendation is given to the programme team on their plans for new clinical facilities which will enhance inter-professional learning opportunities**

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

      Joanna Jackson

      Katie Bosworth *Katie Bosworth*

Date: 23/05/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Northumbria University
Name and titles of programme(s)	**BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy** **MSc Occupational Therapy**
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	**BSc (Hons) - FT/PT** **MSc - PT**
Date of Visit	**8th & 9th May 2007**
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	**Sarah Johnson – Occupational Therapy** **Bernadette Waters – Occupational Therapy**
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	**Katherine Lock – Education Officer** **Daljit Mahoon – Education Officer**
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	**Ian Shell** (Chair) - Associate Dean, Learning & Teaching Support, Newcastle Business School **Colin Chandler** - Director of Postgraduate Studies **Helen Smith** - Principal Lecturer, Learning in Organisations **Jim Clark** - Subject Division Leader, Pre and School learning **Jackie Waterfield** - CSP **Nina Thomson** - CSP **Linda Charlton** - Secretary **Colin Keiley -** Team leader A & R, Stockport Health **Stephen Wordsworth** - Head of department, UCE Birmingham **Joanna Jackson** – Physiotherapist, University of Essex, HPC Visitor **Kathleen Bosworth** - Retired Physiotherapist , HPC visitor

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☒
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**60**

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

Condition1

> **SET 3. Programme management and resource standards**
> **3.6 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.**
>
> **Condition:** The programme team are to provide evidence that they have a system in place and support participation in research training for staff
>
> **Reason:** Documentation did not include CVs of each member on the programme team. There was no evidence supplied to show staff development.

Condition 2

> **3.8 The facilities needed to ensure the welfare and well-being of students must be both adequate and accessible.**

Condition: Documentation must be redrafted and resubmitted to include the universities policy on support for student with learning needs.

Reason: Documentation did not include the universities policy on the support for students with learning needs such as dyslexia

Condition 3

SET 4. Curriculum Standards
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 programme team must redraft and resubmit documentation to include mapping of the learning outcomes against the standards of proficiency

Reason: There was no documented evidence to show mapping against the learning outcomes to provide information as to which module met which standard of proficiency. This is needed to ensure all standards of proficiency are been covered throughout the modules

Condition 4

SET 6. Assessment standards
6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit documentation to include the assessment strategy

Reason: Documentation did not include the assessment strategy. Evidence of this is needed to ensure the maintenance and enhancement of the validity, reliability and explicitness of assessment

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Recommendation: The programme team should review staffing levels to ensure current initiatives can be implemented effectively

Reason: The staffing levels currently appear to fall short of those in other similar institutions and it may be that more staff time will be taken up in implementing the newly proposed programme. It was also noted by the visitors that staff development to doctoral level has been slow and this could also be influenced by the pressure on existing staff available to teach. An increase in the staff establishment should therefore be explored.

Recommendation 2

3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, and IT facilities, including internet access, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Recommendation: The programme team are recommended to arrange the removal of old editions of publications from the library and review reading lists within the documentation

Reason: The reading lists within the documentation were dating back to 1985 publications. In order for students to have up to date information the library needs to have regular updates as do the lists within documentation

Recommendation 3

SET 4. Curriculum standards
4.5 The delivery of the programme must assist autonomous and reflective thinking, and evidence based practice.

Recommendation: The programme team are recommended to review and reinforce the use of PPDF

Reason: It became apparent throughout the visit that the use of PPDF was not used as a tool for assessment and therefore been overlooked by both staff and students

Recommendation 4

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation: We recommend the continuation of building on inter-professional learning in academic and practical initiatives

Reason: The change to this programme to fit in with a suite of programmes to carry the same module of inter-professional learning will bring changes which each profession will need an active involvement throughout

Recommendation 5

SET 5. Practice placements standards
5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Recommendation: The education provider is recommended to collate and disseminate outcomes of placement evaluation on an annual basis to placement providers

Reason: This would fall into line with national quality enhancement expectations concerning the responsibility of the university to share evaluation outcomes with placement providers and thus enhance the students' learning experience whilst on placement.

COMMENDATIONS

- **Commendation is given to the programme team on their plans for new clinical facilities which will enhance inter-professional learning opportunities**

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Sarah Johnson

Bernadette Waters

Date: 23/5/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Northumbria University
Name and titles of programme(s)	**Dip HE Operating Department Practice**
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	**FT**
Date of Visit	**8th – 9th May 2007**
Proposed date of approval to commence	**September 2007**
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	**Colin Keiley** – Team leader A & R – Stockport Health **Stephen Wordsworth** – Head of department – UCE Birmingham
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	**Daljit Mahoon** – Education Officer **Katherine Lock** – Education Officer
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	**Ian Shell (Chair)** – Associate Dean – Learning & Teaching Support – Newcastle business School **Ms Linda Charlton –** Secretary **Colin Chandler –** Director of postgraduate studies **Helen Smith –** Principle lecturer – Learning in organisation **Jim Clark –** Subject division leader – pre and school learning **Patricia McClure** – COT **Jackie Taylor** – COT **Remy Reyes** – COT **Jackie Waterfield** – CSP **Nina Thomson** – CSP **Joanna Jackson** – Physiotherapist – University of Essex – HPC Visitor **Kathleen Bosworth** - Retired Physiotherapist – HPC visitor **Sarah Johnson** – Occupational therapist – University of Plymouth – HPC Visitor **Bernadette Waters –** Occupational therapist – University of Southampton – HPC Visitor

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
New Profession	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	25

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

> **SET 2 Programme admissions**
> **2.1 The admission procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme**
>
> **Condition:**
> Within the admissions information for students, the entry qualifications should be expressed as a UCAS entry tariff.
>
> **Reason:**
> This would enable the university to explore student applications in support of their policy on widening participation. It would help to make admissions information more meaningful to applicant and bring the course in line with information provided across other programmes within the suite of awards.

Condition 2

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Condition
To include within the student handbook the requirement for students entering the second year to submit CRB self declaration.

Reason
Through ensuring that students submit a CRB self declaration in the second year, this will allow any changes in student circumstances relating to CRB will be picked up.

Condition 3

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition:
The programme team must submit documentation to include a form utilised to obtain consent from students prior to them participating as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, e.g. role plays, practicing profession-specific techniques.

Reason:
The documentation lacked evidence which insured that this standard is met. A consent mechanism needs to be put in place to ensure that potential candidates are aware of the expectations of the programme regarding the level of participation expected by and from the student.

Condition 4:

SET 4. Curriculum Standards
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 programme team must map the HPC Standards of Proficiency into the module outlines so that students and mentors are able to identify, when signing off competencies, which of the HPC Standards of Proficiency's are being met.

Reason:
The visitors found it difficult to see how the HPC Standards of Proficiency were clearly being met my students as it was not clearly articulated within the documentation. They were assured that the HPC Standards of Proficiency are built into the learning outcomes however this needs to be made more explicit within the module outlines so both the students and mentors are fully informed. After meeting students and placement providers, it became

apparent that it would be beneficial if the HPC Standards of Proficiency were clearly mapped into the module outlines as suggested

Condition 5

SET 5. Practice placements standards
5.13 The placement providers must have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition:
The programme team must submit an equal opportunities and anti discriminatory policy for students attending non NHS placements.

Reason:
The visitors were unable to see clear evidence of an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy for students within non NHS placements. Documentation must be submitted which clearly presents that a policy within these placements is present

Condition 6

SET 5. Practice placements standards
5.7 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:
5.7.2 timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;
5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;

Condition:
Statements presented within the documentation relating to HPC need to be corrected. This refers to:
1) In volume 2, page 81, first paragraph in section 16, it reads: 'As your programme leads to eligibility for registration, you should be fully aware of the Health Professions Council Code of Professional Conduct.' This needs to be amended to: 'As your programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration, you should be fully aware of the Health Professions Council Standards of conduct, performance and ethics and Standards of Proficiency for Operating Department Practitioners'
2) In volume 2, page 27, first paragraph in section 2.4.1, it reads: 'ODP students are required to complete 3000 of theory and practice within the programme in order to meet the criteria for HPC Registration'. This needs to be removed for HPC do not specifically stipulate the number of hours students need to complete.
3) In volume 2, page 6 the abbreviation 'RODP' is used. This is not necessary as all Operating Department Practitioners are now deemed to be registered and the title is therefore not helpful. This should also apply to section 4.2.2, on page 37 again in volume 2.
4) In volume 2 Page 81 Section 14 it states ' Students will be expected to observe, participate and finally to engage in inter-professional and inter-agency work during the three-year programme in order to meet the NMC proficiency' this is incorrect and should read 'Students will be expected to

observe, participate and finally to engage in inter-professional and inter-agency work during the two year programme in order to meet the HPC Standards of Proficiency

5) In volume 2 Page 81, Section 15 it states: 'This is to ensure that students make up the relevant hours and type of experience in order to meet the regulations of the programme and the Professional Statutory Regulatory Body.' In light that the Professional Statutory Regulatory Body is HPC, this statement heeds to be amended, HPC do not specifically stipulate the number of hours students need to complete.

6) The names of the module leaders should be included within the module descriptors

Reason:
Any references to HPC need to be correct to avoid any confusion in the role of the regulator and to ensure that students and mentors are made fully aware of the HPC statutory requirements. With point 6, within the Module descriptors some of the names of the module leaders were not included, which made it unclear who the module leader was. There should be consistency, informing students who the module leaders are for all of the modules, not just a few.

Condition 7

SET 6. Assessment standards
6.7.3 for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition:
To include an explicit statement within the programme specification that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility for admission to the register.

Reason:
It was not clearly articulated within the documentation that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility for admission to the register. This needs to be included within the documentation, ensuring that students are fully informed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

SET 2 Programme admissions
2.2.1 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English

Recommendation
To include a statement in the admission requirements for overseas students to have an English IELTs level 6 on entry.

Reason:
The requirement for overseas students to demonstrate a good command of English is included within the documentation; however the visitors felt that through including more detail, students would be fully informed of the requirements.

Recommendation 2

2.2.4 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

Recommendation:
To review the academic entry standards of 5 GCSEs

Reason:
The visitors felt that the level of the academic entry standards, consisting of 5 GCSEs could be seen to be quite low and therefore this may lead to some students experiencing difficulties in completing the course based on their unrealistic expectations of what is needed to successfully complete the award.

Recommendation 3

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Recommendation:
To monitor the staffing in relation to any increases in student numbers or staff workload.

Reason:
There should always be an assurance that there is enough staff to deliver the programme effectively, without compromising our standards and that there is an adequate balance between staff and students.

Recommendation 4

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

Recommendation:
To utilise any opportunity for Operating Department Practitioners to have more input into the programme.

Reason:
In order to develop the programme and its profession specific knowledge and skills, the Visitors felt that more input from additional Operating Department Practitioners, with the relevant academic qualifications and experience would enhance the development of the programme

Recommendation 5

3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, and IT facilities, including internet access, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Recommendation:
To review the stock of periodicals, subject books and access to e-journals and ensure these resources are kept up to date.

Reason:
In light of student's comments and supported by evidence from a visit to the library, the visitors felt that access to resources could be improved and the university should aim to ensure resources are updated.

Recommendation 6

SET 5. Practice placements standards
5.2 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement.

Recommendation:
The visitors would like to the course team to continue to explore the possibilities to have more Operating Department Practitioners to act as mentors for Operating Department Practitioner students

Reason:
Through having more Operating Department Practitioners acting as mentors, they would have more subject specific knowledge which would enhance students experience and learning and act as professional role models within the clinical area

Recommendation 7

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation:
To explore opportunities to improve specific Operating Department Practitioner resources to enable clinical skills teaching.

Reason:
Through improving more specific Operating Department Practitioner resources it would enhance teaching and learning and student experience on the programme.

Recommendation 8

SET 4. Curriculum Standards
4.6 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the subjects in the curriculum.
SET 2 Programme admissions
2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Recommendation:
To review the effectiveness of the extended initial theory placement in light of difficulties in obtaining CRB clearance.

Reason:
The theory aspect of the programme was placed at the start to aid the duration for CRB clearance checks to be processed and not to aid the pedagogical development of the students   It is recommended that the programme team should monitor students' experience of the effectiveness of having this extended theory element at the start of the programme.

COMMENDATIONS

- Commendation is given to the programme team on their plans for new clinical facilities which will enhance inter-professional learning opportunities

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

> **Mr Colin Keiley**

> **Mr Stephen Wordsworth**

Date: 23.05.2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Paisley
Name and titles of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Part time
Date of Visit	1 May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	David Whitmore, Paramedic Gordon Pollard, Paramedic
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Professor Malcolm Crowe, Chair Nina Anderson, University of Paisley

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	☐	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	<mark>35 x 2</mark>

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

2.2.1 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English;
2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria including criminal convictions checks; and
2.2.3 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria including compliance with any health requirements.

Condition: The employer declaration must be amended to make it clear that the employee/student must have an up to date enhanced CRB check before they can commence the course, and that the employer believes their level of English language and health is sufficient for the course.

Reason: The Visitors were advised that CRB checks are completed, however this was not clear in the documentation. It was also not clear how the University ensures that students have a sufficient level of English language and meet relevant health requirements.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

Condition: The documentation should be updated to make it clear that aegrotat awards are not available for this programme.

Reason: This was not clear in the documentation.

Deadline for conditions to be met:	**31 May 2007**
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval:	**12 June 2007**
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval:	**12 June 2007**

RECOMMENDATIONS

6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of an external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC register.

Recommendation: That before an external examiner is appointed the course team liaise with the HPC to establish the credentials required to meet HPC standards.

Reason: The programme team currently intends to appoint an external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC register, however the HPC is currently consulting on a change to this standard so before an external examiner is appointed the HEI should check the latest requirements.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training. We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

David Whitmore
Gordon Pollard

Date: 1 May 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	**University of Bangor**
Name and titles of programme(s)	**Dip HE Operating Department Practice**
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	**FT**
Date of Visit	**17th – 18th April 2007**
Proposed date of approval to commence	**September 2007**
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	**Mr Derek Adrian Harris** **Mr Colin Keiley**
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	**Miss Daljit Mahoon** **Miss Katherine Lock**
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	**Dr David Wright** – UWB, Chair **Miss Rachel Ley** – (UWB, Secretary) **Professor K Janet Pritchard** – UWB, Head of School Education **Dr Dei Huws** – UWB, Lecturer, School of Ocean Science. **Dr Ioan Ap Dewi** - UWB, Academic registrar

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
New Profession	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	9

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 2 Programme Admissions
2.1 The admission procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme.
6.7.2 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for awards which do not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register not to contain any reference to an HPC protected title in their title.
6.7.3 for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register

Condition:
Statements presented within the documentation relating to HPC need to be corrected. This refers to:
1) The reference made for the IELTS level of English on application of 7, which should be 6.
2) The statement on page 4 within the student handbook under the attendance policy needs to be amended or removed.
3) A statement needs to be included within the student handbook, clearly specifying awards which do not provide eligibility to register with the HPC.
4) A statement needs to be included within the student handbook, clearly specifying the aegrotat awards are not considered within this programme and to not provide eligibility to register with the HPC.

Reason:
1) It is not a requirement for students who do not speak English, on entry to the programme, to have an English language standard of IELTs 7.0. An IELTs level of 6.0 is acceptable providing on completion of the programme the student reaches IELTs 7.0, which is the requirement for them to meet the Standards of Proficiency, requirement under 1.b.4.
2) On page 4 within the student handbook under Attendance Policy, it reads:
'A course requirement, in order for you to be eligible to register with the

Health Professions Council (HPC) is that you undertake ands successfully complete ALL of the theoretical and practical elements during the next two years', this is untrue. This is not a specific requirement from the HPC. Our standard on attendance is to ensure that a system of monitoring attendance is in place and students are informed on when attendance is mandatory, ensuring that all students can meet the Standards of Proficiency to be able to practice safely and effectively, on completion of the programme.
3) There was not mention within the documentation provided for students of awards that do not provide eligibility to register. A statement should be included so students are well informed.
4) There was not mention within the documentation provided for students that Aegrotat awards are not considered. A statement should be included so students are well informed.

Condition 2:

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition:
The programme team must produce and submit a paper which demonstrates how in light of the subsequent conditions and recommendations, that the course will be managed effectively in the future.

Reason:
With the prospect of conditions being met and recommendations being considered, enhancements to the programme will be made. Through producing an outline demonstrating how these changes will affect and enhance the management of the programme, it would help to assure the visitors that the programme team understand the implications and their thoughts in specific to the quality and improvements of staffing in the future.

Condition 3:

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

Condition:
The programme team must resubmit a complete set of up to date CVs
, demonstrating the programme teams areas of expertise, their relevance to this programme and their roles within it.

Reason:
The visitors found it difficult to gage whether staff had relevant expertises and knowledge for it was not clearly articulated within the CVs that were submitted.

Condition 4:

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

Condition:
The programme team must produce a clear plan, outlining the staff development for each member of the programme team.

Reason:
It was unclear within the documentation and CVs, what the programme team have and are presently doing to ensure their continual professional development is being carried out. Examples need to be provided for each member of the programme team, to enable the visitors to be assured that this set is being met.

Condition 5:

SET 2 Programme Admissions
2.1 The admission procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme.
SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.11 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 course documentation needs to be revised to make it more explicit where attendance is mandatory.

Reason:
After meeting the programme team it became apparent that some students were negotiating holidays during lecture periods. A clearer and consistent outline of where attendance is mandatory needs to be clearly articulated within the documentation.

Condition 6:

SET 4. Curriculum Standards
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.
SET 6. Assessment standards
6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.

Condition:
 The programme team must revise and submit a mapping document which maps the learning outcomes against the assessments and the HPC Standards of Proficiency.

Reason:
It was not clearly articulated within the documentation how the HPC Standards of Proficiency are being achieved by the students through the learning outcomes and the assessments.

Condition 7:

4.5 The delivery of the programme must assist autonomous and reflective thinking, and evidence based practice.

Condition:
The programme team must revise and submit an outline of how autonomous practice and reflective thinking is developed by students within the programme.

Reason:
It was not clear within the documentation how students develop autonomous practice and reflective thinking within the programme.

RECCOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1:

SET 2 Programme admissions
2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including:
2.2.2 criminal convictions checks;
2.2.3 compliance with any health requirements; and
2.2.4 appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

Recommendation:
To revise the admissions process, such as the CRB, health checks and the entrance criteria, to consider the appropriateness of 5 GCSEs

Reason:
The visitors felt that the processes for CRB and health checks could be improved and the level of the academic entry standards, consisting of 5 GCSEs could be seen to be quite low.

Recommendation 2:

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Recommendation:
The programme team should seriously consider appointing another Operating Department Practitioner

Reason:
At present there are two main members of the team within which there is only one Operating Department Practitioner who is the programme leader. In order to develop the programme and its profession specific knowledge and skills, the Visitors felt the appointment of an additional (Registered) Operating Department Practitioner with the relevant academic qualifications and experience would enhance the development of the programme and assist the programme leader.
Also, even though there is also another member of the team to support the programme leader, concerns were raised that if one where off sick, there is pressure on the other to manage the workload, which reinforces the positive impact an additional member of staff would make.

Recommendation 3:

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

Recommendation:

The visitors encourage the programme team to accelerate a programme for ICT and library support, such as library returns and use of blackboard.

Reason:
Students needed to be kept informed of library offers and felt blackboard would be a good way of doing this. At present the use of blackboard has not been implemented and flexibility in library returns across sites could be improved. The visitors felt that more use of ICT and exploring extending library opening hours would enhance communication and support students in these areas.

Recommendation 4

SET 4. Curriculum Standards
4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation:
The University of Bangor should consider as a matter of urgency the development and implementation of Inter professional learning programmes, relevant to all of the health and social care students.

Reason:
The visitors felt the university has significant opportunities to develop an inter-professional learning programme for all the health and social care students. This would enhance student experience and students would benefit from the exposure to the skills and knowledge for each professional group.

COMMENDATIONS

1) **The diligence and enthusiasm of the programme leader.**

2) **The availability of protected time afforded by the trust hospitals for practice facilitators to support students.**

3) **Obvious enthusiasm and involvement of practice educators on the ethos of the programme.**

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

      Mr Derek Adrian Harris

      Mr Colin Keiley

Date: 26/4/07