

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Birmingham City University
Programme name	Non-medical Prescribing for Health Care Professionals (Level 6)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist Radiographer Chiropodist/Podiatrist
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Date of visit	21 July 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	11
Commendations	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist', 'Radiographer' or 'Chiropodist/Podiatrist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards of proficiency (SOP) for this entitlement.

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register, the HPC also approve a small number of programmes for those already on the Register. The post-registration programmes we currently approve are supplementary prescribing programmes (for chiropodists / podiatrists, radiographers and physiotherapists) and programmes in local anaesthetics and prescription-only medicine (for chiropodists / podiatrists).

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 16 August 2010 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 26 August 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept 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 23 August 2010. 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 16 September 2010.

Introduction

The HPC 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, and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HPC 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 (SOP) for this entitlement..

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered Principles of Prescribing for Health Care Professionals (Level 7) programme. The education provider, the NMC and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on this programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the NMC, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist/Podiatrist) Gordon Pollard (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Brendon Edmonds
Proposed student numbers	45 per cohort (2 intakes per year)
Initial approval	1 September 2007
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Stuart Brand (Birmingham City University)
Secretary	Tess Clarke (Birmingham City University)
Members of the joint panel	Marie Roberts-Davis (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Diane Barrowclough (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Sandra Burley (University of Hull) Barbara Novak (City University, London) Julia Haines (Sandwell and West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust) Robert Timmerman (Mid

	Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust) Sharon Dempsey (Former Student Representative) Martin Harvey (Former Student Representative) Rachel Curzon (Birmingham City University) Phillip Dee (Birmingham City University) Barbara Nugent (Birmingham City University)
--	---

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured 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 (SOP) for this entitlement.

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 47 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 10 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. 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 is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme.

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 all the programme documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted the programme documentation made incorrect reference to HPC requirements for admission to the programme. In particular the programme specification makes the following reference:

'You must provide evidence of meeting the Health Professions Council criteria for eligibility to undertake the Supplementary Prescribing pathway:

- a) Registered with the Health Professions Council in one of the relevant Allied Health Professions.
- b) Be professionally practising in an environment where there is an identified need for the individual to regularly use supplementary prescribing.
- c) Normally have at least 3 years relevant post-qualification experience.

The HPC does not set criteria for eligibility to undertake supplementary prescribing. The visitors consider this information to be misleading to an applicant or student on the programme. The visitors require the education provider to redraft the programme documentation to remove the reference to the HPC setting any criteria for eligibility to apply to the programme.

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of an audit used to approve and monitor placements which ensures the provision of a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and at the visit, an audit of placements was conducted. However the visitors did not receive any documentation outlining the details of this audit and how the audit process ensures every placement setting provides a safe and supportive environment.

To be satisfied this standard is met the visitors require the education provider to submit further documentation which clearly illustrates the audit process. Any documentation submitted should also include a copy of the audit document and an example of a completed audit. The audit must clearly address how it is used to conduct a risk assessment of each placement site, and a placement induction, and how students are made aware about risks and safety issues.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the system used to approve and monitor placement environments.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and at the visit, an audit of placements was conducted. However the visitors did not receive any documentation outlining the details of this audit and how the audit process ensures every placement setting provides an appropriate learning environment.

To be satisfied this standard is met the visitors require the education provider to submit further documentation which clearly illustrates the audit process and how this is used to approve and monitor all placements. Any documentation submitted should also include a copy of the audit document and an example of a completed audit.

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 of a system used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and regularly monitored.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and at the visit, an audit of placements was conducted. However the visitors did not receive any documentation outlining the details of this audit and how the audit process ensures every placement setting has equality and diversity policies in place.

To be satisfied this standard is met the visitors require the education provider to submit further documentation which clearly illustrates the audit process. Any documentation submitted should also include a copy of the audit document and an example of a completed audit. The audit must clearly address how it is used to ensure equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and monitored.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the system used to ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and at the visit, an audit of placements was conducted. However the visitors did not receive any documentation outlining the details of this audit and how the audit process ensures every placement setting has appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

To be satisfied this SET is met the visitors require the education provider to submit further documentation which clearly illustrates the audit process. Any documentation submitted should also include a copy of the audit document and an example of a completed audit. The audit must clearly address how it is used to ensure each placement setting has appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support the students learning.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the system used to ensure practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and at the visit, an audit of placements was conducted. However the visitors did not receive any documentation outlining the details of this audit and how the audit process ensures every placement setting has educators with relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

To be satisfied this standard is met the visitors require the education provider to submit further documentation which clearly illustrates the audit process. Any documentation submitted should also include a copy of the audit document and an example of a completed audit. The audit must clearly address how it is used to ensure each placement setting has educators which have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience needed to support the students learning.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure Designated Medical Practitioners undertake training on a regular basis.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation that Designated Medical Supervisors were required to undertake training prior to working with students. However, at the visit the programme team advised the training sessions were not well attended due to the unavailability of the supervisors. The visitors were not satisfied there was an appropriate system in place to ensure all Designated Medical Supervisors received the necessary training to undertake the role.

The visitors require further documentation which addresses how Designated Medical Supervisors will receive training prior to working with students and on an ongoing basis. In particular, any documentation should detail an appropriate method of training delivery given attendance at training workshops is low.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the system used to ensure practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and at the visit, an audit of placements was conducted. However the visitors did not receive any documentation outlining the details of this audit and how the audit process ensures every placement educator is appropriately registered.

To be satisfied this standard is met the visitors require the education provider to submit further documentation which clearly illustrates the audit process. Any documentation submitted should also include a copy of the audit document and an example of a completed audit. The audit must clearly address how it is used to ensure each placement educator is appropriately registered.

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 ensure Designated Medical Practitioners undertake training on a regular basis.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation that Designated Medical Supervisors were required to undertake training prior to working with students. However, at the visit the programme team advised the training sessions were not well attended due to the unavailability of the supervisors. The visitors were not satisfied Designated Medical Supervisors received the training required to be fully prepared for placement education.

The visitors require further documentation which addresses how Designated Medical Supervisors will receive training prior to working with students and on an ongoing basis. In particular, any documentation should detail an appropriate method of training delivery given attendance at training workshops is low.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft the programme documentation to clarify the assessment weightings on the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted the assessment weightings in the programme documentation. Some assessments were pass/fail and other assessments had pass/fail percentages applied. Overall assessment weightings were given to areas of assessment also. The visitors were not clear from the documentation, the requirements for progression and achievement and if the programme carried an overall weighting. Further clarity was sought at the visit regarding these issues. The programme team did clarify the assessment weightings set for the programme.

The visitors consider the lack of clarity regarding assessment weightings within the programme documentation could be potentially misleading to students. In order to be satisfied this standard is met, the visitors require the programme documentation be redrafted to further clarify the assessment weightings and requirements students must meet for progression on the programme.

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to ensure it provides all the information an applicant from private practice would need to apply to the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted at the visit the programme primarily took students from public sector settings. However, on occasion, a self funded student from private practice would enrol on the programme. The visitors noted the programme documentation was primarily aimed at students within the public sector, but were satisfied private sector students were able to access the information they might require.

The visitors do however recommend the education consider reviewing all the programme documentation and promotional materials (including the website) to ensure applicants from the private sector have all the information they require prior to applying to the programme.

Gordon Burrow
Gordon Pollard

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Birmingham City University
Programme name	Principles of Prescribing for Health Care Professionals (Level 7)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist Radiographer Chiropodist/Podiatrist
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Date of visit	21 July 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	7
Commendations	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist', 'Radiographer' or 'Chiropodist/Podiatrist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards of proficiency (SOP) for this entitlement.

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register, the HPC also approve a small number of programmes for those already on the Register. The post-registration programmes we currently approve are supplementary prescribing programmes (for chiropodists / podiatrists, radiographers and physiotherapists) and programmes in local anaesthetics and prescription-only medicine (for chiropodists / podiatrists).

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 16 August 2010 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 26 August 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept 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 23 August 2010. 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 16 September 2010.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC 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 (SOP) for this entitlement.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the Non-medical Prescribing for Health Care Professionals (Level 6) programme. The education provider, the NMC and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on this programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the NMC, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist/Podiatrist) Gordon Pollard (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Brendon Edmonds
Proposed student numbers	45 per cohort (2 intakes per year)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2010
Chair	Stuart Brand (Birmingham City University)
Secretary	Tess Clarke (Birmingham City University)
Members of the joint panel	Marie Roberts-Davis (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Diane Barrowclough (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Sandra Burley (University of Hull) Barbara Novak (City University, London) Julia Haines (Sandwell and West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust) Robert Timmerman (Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust) Sharon Dempsey (Former Student Representative) Martin Harvey (Former Student

	Representative) Rachel Curzon (Birmingham City University) Phillip Dee (Birmingham City University) Barbara Nugent (Birmingham City University)
--	--

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured 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 (SOP) for this entitlement.

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 47 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 10 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. 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 is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme.

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 all the programme documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted the programme documentation made incorrect reference to HPC requirements for admission to the programme. In particular the programme specification makes the following reference:

'You must provide evidence of meeting the Health Professions Council criteria for eligibility to undertake the Supplementary Prescribing pathway:

- a) Registered with the Health Professions Council in one of the relevant Allied Health Professions.
- b) Be professionally practising in an environment where there is an identified need for the individual to regularly use supplementary prescribing.
- c) Normally have at least 3 years relevant post-qualification experience.

The HPC does not set criteria for eligibility to undertake supplementary prescribing. The visitors consider this information to be misleading to an applicant or student on the programme. The visitors require the education provider to redraft the programme documentation to remove the reference to the HPC setting any criteria for eligibility to apply to the programme.

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of an audit used to approve and monitor placements which ensures the provision of a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and at the visit, an audit of placements was conducted. However the visitors did not receive any documentation outlining the details of this audit and how the audit process ensures every placement setting provides a safe and supportive environment.

To be satisfied this standard is met the visitors require the education provider to submit further documentation which clearly illustrates the audit process. Any documentation submitted should also include a copy of the audit document and an example of a completed audit. The audit must clearly address how it is used to conduct a risk assessment of each placement site, and a placement induction, and how students are made aware about risks and safety issues.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the system used to approve and monitor placement environments.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and at the visit, an audit of placements was conducted. However the visitors did not receive any documentation outlining the details of this audit and how the audit process ensures every placement setting provides an appropriate learning environment.

To be satisfied this standard is met the visitors require the education provider to submit further documentation which clearly illustrates the audit process and how this is used to approve and monitor all placements. Any documentation submitted should also include a copy of the audit document and an example of a completed audit.

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 of a system used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and regularly monitored.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and at the visit, an audit of placements was conducted. However the visitors did not receive any documentation outlining the details of this audit and how the audit process ensures every placement setting has equality and diversity policies in place.

To be satisfied this standard is met the visitors require the education provider to submit further documentation which clearly illustrates the audit process. Any documentation submitted should also include a copy of the audit document and an example of a completed audit. The audit must clearly address how it is used to ensure equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and monitored.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the system used to ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and at the visit, an audit of placements was conducted. However the visitors did not receive any documentation outlining the details of this audit and how the audit process ensures every placement setting has appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

To be satisfied this SET is met the visitors require the education provider to submit further documentation which clearly illustrates the audit process. Any documentation submitted should also include a copy of the audit document and an example of a completed audit. The audit must clearly address how it is used to ensure each placement setting has appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support the students learning.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the system used to ensure practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and at the visit, an audit of placements was conducted. However the visitors did not receive any documentation outlining the details of this audit and how the audit process ensures every placement setting has educators with relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

To be satisfied this standard is met the visitors require the education provider to submit further documentation which clearly illustrates the audit process. Any documentation submitted should also include a copy of the audit document and an example of a completed audit. The audit must clearly address how it is used to ensure each placement setting has educators which have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience needed to support the students learning.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure Designated Medical Practitioners undertake training on a regular basis.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation that Designated Medical Supervisors were required to undertake training prior to working with students. However, at the visit the programme team advised the training sessions were not well attended due to the unavailability of the supervisors. The visitors were not satisfied there was an appropriate system in place to ensure all Designated Medical Supervisors received the necessary training to undertake the role.

The visitors require further documentation which addresses how Designated Medical Supervisors will receive training prior to working with students and on an ongoing basis. In particular, any documentation should detail an appropriate method of training delivery given attendance at training workshops is low.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the system used to ensure practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and at the visit, an audit of placements was conducted. However the visitors did not receive any documentation outlining the details of this audit and how the audit process ensures every placement educator is appropriately registered.

To be satisfied this standard is met the visitors require the education provider to submit further documentation which clearly illustrates the audit process. Any documentation submitted should also include a copy of the audit document and an example of a completed audit. The audit must clearly address how it is used to ensure each placement educator is appropriately registered.

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 ensure Designated Medical Practitioners undertake training on a regular basis.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation that Designated Medical Supervisors were required to undertake training prior to working with students. However, at the visit the programme team advised the training sessions were not well attended due to the unavailability of the supervisors. The visitors were not satisfied Designated Medical Supervisors received the training required to be fully prepared for placement education.

The visitors require further documentation which addresses how Designated Medical Supervisors will receive training prior to working with students and on an ongoing basis. In particular, any documentation should detail an appropriate method of training delivery given attendance at training workshops is low.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft the programme documentation to clarify the assessment weightings on the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted the assessment weightings in the programme documentation. Some assessments were pass/fail and other assessments had pass/fail percentages applied. Overall assessment weightings were given to areas of assessment also. The visitors were not clear from the documentation, the requirements for progression and achievement and if the programme carried an overall weighting. Further clarity was sought at the visit regarding these issues. The programme team did clarify the assessment weightings set for the programme.

The visitors consider the lack of clarity regarding assessment weightings within the programme documentation could be potentially misleading to students. In order to be satisfied this standard is met, the visitors require the programme documentation be redrafted to further clarify the assessment weightings and requirements students must meet for progression on the programme.

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to ensure it provides all the information an applicant from private practice would need to apply to the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted at the visit the programme primarily took students from public sector settings. However, on occasion, a self funded student from private practice would enrol on the programme. The visitors noted the programme documentation was primarily aimed at students within the public sector, but were satisfied private sector students were able to access the information they might require.

The visitors do however recommend the education consider reviewing all the programme documentation and promotional materials (including the website) to ensure applicants from the private sector have all the information they require prior to applying to the programme.

Gordon Burrow
Gordon Pollard

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to ensure it provides all the information an applicant from private practice would need to apply to the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted at the visit the programme primarily took students from public sector settings. However, on occasion, a self funded student from private practice would enrol on the programme. The visitors noted the programme documentation was primarily aimed at students within the public sector, but were satisfied private sector students were able to access the information they might require.

The visitors do however recommend the education consider reviewing all the programme documentation and promotional materials (including the website) to ensure applicants from the private sector have all the information they require prior to applying to the programme.

Gordon Burrow
Gordon Pollard

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	City University
Programme name	Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DPsych)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Counselling psychologist
Date of visit	30 June – 1 July 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	14

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Counselling psychologist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health 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 5 August 2010 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 26 August 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept 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 8 October 2010. 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 18 November 2010.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner psychology profession came onto the register in July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The professional body and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	David Packwood (Counselling Psychologist) Andrew Richards (Educational Psychologist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort once a year
Initial approval	26 September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	29 September 2010
Chair	Andrew Denis (City University)
Secretary	Louise Markes (City University)
Members of the joint panel	Laura Clarke (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society) Terry Hanley (British Psychological Society) Elena Manafi (British Psychological Society) Kimberley Wilson (British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Completed student feedback forms	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Additional programme information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme management information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Feedback from Trainees as given to the BPS prior to the visit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review External examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it. However, they did provide two external examiners' reports for the last academic year.

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured 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 their 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 46 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 11 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. 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 is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

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 advertising material to include information about the HPC alongside information about the BPS where appropriate.

Reason: The material provided on the education provider's website had a section about the programme with a statement that read –“The Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology is a professional training programme, accredited by the British Psychological Society (BPS). (www.city.ac.uk/psychology/counselling/3yr_programme.html Date: 5 July 2010)”. The visitors considered the profession has been statutory regulated by the HPC since July 2009 and as such, information about the HPC needs to be clearly articulated for all potential applicants alongside information about the BPS. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the advertising materials (such as on the website and in any prospectuses) to include information about the HPC alongside information about the BPS where appropriate.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to include clear and correct references to the HPC.

Reason: The visitors noted the programme documentation provided prior to the visit made no mention of the HPC in the taught academic content. Discussions with the trainees indicated they were aware of the HPC, but only in regards to certain aspects (the SOPs and the programme leading to eligibility to apply for the Register). The profession has been statutory regulated by the HPC since July 2009 and as such, information about the HPC needs to be clearly articulated for all trainees. Information about the new landscape of statutory regulation, the Register and all HPC standards is important for the trainees understanding of the HPC in relation to professional practice.

The visitors therefore require revised programme documentation which demonstrates clear and correct references to the HPC, to reflect the current landscape of statutory regulation and so facilitate the trainees understanding of the HPC in all supporting resources used for the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that the programmes consent protocols are clearly articulated.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included a Practitioner Training Contract which included the requirement for trainees to - “Participate fully in all of my training components, including all elements of my taught modules, external personal development and clinical placements“. The programme documentation did not provide any further information about consent or ‘opting out’ for trainees. Discussions with the programme team indicated they were fully aware of issues that could arise during the programme and had measures in place to turn to if trainees were unwilling to participate in particular areas of the programme (particular lectures, sessions, role play, etc). The measures discussed were those such as private meetings to discuss the issues, extended reading materials provided and the option to be present in the room but withdraw from the session. Discussions with the trainees indicated they were aware that it was possible to withdraw from particular topics being taught but they were not aware of any forms they had signed or protocols which clearly articulated this.

The visitors were satisfied in regards to there being a consent protocol in place. The visitors were not satisfied enough information was provided for the trainees regarding the consent aspect to the Practitioner Training Contract or the education providers approach to issues arising from specific areas of the teaching. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to include information for the trainees regarding the approaches to be taken to issues arising from their personal concerns about specific areas of the teaching (such as expanding the Practitioner Training Contract or providing a guidance document about consent).

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition: The education provider must include references to the HPC’s standards of conduct performance and ethics in all relevant programme documentation.

Reason: The visitors noted the programme documentation provided prior to the visit made no mention of the HPC’s Standards of conduct, performance and ethics within the taught components of the programme. There was also a confusing reference to HPC standards in the programme handbook (p28) - “All trainees should be familiar with the HPC and BPS Codes of Conduct, Ethical Principles and Guidelines and Guidelines for the Professional Practice of Counselling Psychology, published by the Health Professions Council and the British Psychological Society.” It was not clear which standards published by the HPC were being referred to.

The profession has been statutory regulated by the HPC since July 2009 and as such, information about the HPC, the Standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the Standards of proficiency, need to be clearly articulated for all trainees.

The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation includes specific references to HPC's Standards of conduct, performance and ethics wherever it is deemed appropriate to reflect the standards being taught within the programmes content in order to facilitate trainees understanding of the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how they maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: The documentation provided and discussions at the visit detailed the processes for approving placements. The placement co-ordinator who had recently been recruited had taken a more involved approach to placement recruitment with the trainees. The initial approval conversations were held between the placements and the education provider and then a series of tasks were to be completed such as a health and safety check, curriculum vitae checks, placement supervisor registration checks and conversations around trainee working arrangements. Once these tasks had been completed and the placement had been approved the placement then received more detailed information about the placement and other associated information. The placement provider details were kept on the education provider records as being suitable to undertake trainees. A yearly audit was then carried out across all approved placements. After this initial check there was no further regular monitoring of the individual placements only the overarching audit of all placements. Additionally it was discussed that there was no regular structured communications between education provider and placement providers. All contact would be via the placement provider in cases of concern over trainees' performance.

The visitors were concerned that there was no way for the education provider to monitor the placement to maintain the safe and supportive environment for the trainees without a regular check on each individual placement. The visitors considered the yearly audit to be appropriate to identify substantial problems with placement running overall but not appropriate to monitor each individual placement's qualities over the running of the placement. Therefore the visitors require further evidence that the education provider has a system in place which thoroughly and effectively approves and monitors placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to show how they ensure placement supervisors have undertaken appropriate initial and refresher training.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors judged that it was not clear how the education provider ensured that placement supervisors were appropriately trained prior to working with trainees or continued to maintain their skills for working with trainees. In discussions with the placement supervisors and programme team, it became evident that the programme team provided placements with information and forms to complete but no training was required to be undertaken either at the education provider or externally.

The visitors were aware there are difficulties in ensuring all placement supervisors are initially trained and then have undertaken follow up training. The initial training would be to prepare placement supervisors to work with trainees and secondary 'refresher' training would enable the education provider to keep placement supervisors up to date with any changes to the programme and refresh their skills at working with trainees. Training the placement supervisors helps prepare them to work with trainees in regards to assessment and education provider assessment protocols, protecting the public and trainees and ensuring the placement is a safe and effective environment.

It is the education provider's responsibility to ensure appropriate training of some kind – either run by the education provider directly, run by external training bodies or by other education providers using the same placements, has taken place and is monitored. Therefore, the visitors require that the education provider provides further evidence to show how this standard is met.

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 that there is regular and effective collaboration in place between the education provider and placement provider.

Reason: Discussions and documentation highlighted that there was no regular structured communications between education provider and placement providers. The initial communications were carried out to approve the placement in a format that could be face to face but did not need to be. Once the initial forms had been filled in by the placements and submitted to the education provider there was no other maintained contact between education provider and placement. There was the opportunity for placements to contact the education provider in the case of problems with trainees but there was no other continued contact encouraged.

The visitors were concerned by this lack of communication between the two parties. Communication in any form helps to facilitate a working relationship and is indicative of effective collaboration between the placement and the education provider. The communication (which could take the form of regular emails, meetings, training sessions, telephone calls, etc) is important for both the education provider and the placement. The communications can be used to ensure the placements are aware of any changes which may affect their trainees, to monitor the placement environments, to ensure both parties know the appropriate lines of communication, to give the placement the opportunity to feedback into the running and delivery of the programme or to allow feedback

from trainees and placements to flow both ways, to enhance the placement experience for trainees.

The visitors therefore require further evidence that there is regular and effective collaboration in place between the education provider and placement provider outside of the initial approval system.

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 documentation which clearly outlines how the learning outcomes for placements are consistently assessed.

Reason: The clinical placement documentation provided prior to the visit included the form which placement supervisors fill in to assess a trainee during and at the end of a placement (interim and final) (Placement Supervisor's Evaluation – PL6). This form had a choice of either a 'satisfactory' or 'not satisfactory' rating with a space to add comments if needed.

The visitors noted there were no guidance criteria which would differentiate between 'satisfactory' and 'not satisfactory'. The visitors also noted there were no requirements for placement supervisors to undertake training prior to working with trainees and there was no requirement for any structured contact between the education provider and the placement (such as a mandatory visit) prior to the trainee starting. The visitors were also aware that the evaluation form was to be completed on a biannual basis and was the only formal assessment of trainee skills taking place.

The visitors were not satisfied different placement supervisors would all use the same measures to assess a trainees' competencies without any clear criteria for what equals a 'satisfactory' or 'not satisfactory' rating. The visitors were also concerned by the fact the evaluation form was the only formal assessment and it was undertaken twice a year. This could pose a risk in that it is the only recorded way of determining any difficulties trainees may be having in meeting all learning outcomes and so needs to be completed by all placement supervisors in a standard method.

The visitors therefore require further evidence which clearly articulates how the education provider ensures learning outcomes for each placement are consistently assessed.

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 documentation which clearly outlines how individual placement supervisors are fully prepared for each individual placement.

Reason: The placement documentation provided detailed information for the preparation of placements given to placement supervisors prior to undertaking any trainees. Whilst discussions at the visit detailed the processes further, it was apparent that the programme relied on the trainees to find their own placements, although the education provider had recently recruited a new placement co-ordinator who had taken a more involved approach to placement recruitment with the trainees.

The Placement Supervisor's Evaluation form is filled out by the placement supervisor at the end of the placement and it is here that goals for the next placement are addressed. It then falls solely to the trainee to take this information forward with their next placement supervisor. Discussions with the trainees, placements supervisors and programme team confirmed that prior to the placement there was no information which passed to the new placement supervisor regarding trainees apart from that passed on by the trainees themselves with the Placement Supervisor's Evaluation form from the last placement. Discussions with the programme team and placement supervisors additionally highlighted that it was only if there was a serious concern about a particular trainee's performance that the placement supervisor should alert the education provider who would then become involved.

The visitors noted that there was a risk of trainees failing to alert placement supervisors to their developmental needs at the beginning of placements. In these circumstances it would only be if the placement supervisor identified significant areas which need attention, through the interim Placement Supervisor's Evaluation form, where these areas would be considered. The lack of any placement supervisor training or structured contact throughout placement between the education provider and the education provider could pose a risk in that some learning outcomes may not be fully addressed by trainees or placement supervisors.

The visitors considered that to ensure all learning outcomes are addressed fully and in order to be fully prepared for placements, there must be some prior knowledge of the trainee before the placement starts (such as a mechanism which passes feedback between placement supervisors). The visitors therefore require further evidence which clearly articulates how the education provider

ensures individual placement supervisors are fully prepared for each individual placement.

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to ensure it is clearly articulated that exit awards do not lead to the eligibility to apply for the HPC register.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit made it clear that the programme award led to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register. It was also clear that there were a number of other exit awards to be granted for trainees who exited the programme at various points without completing the full programme – “It is possible for students to exit the programme at various stages and gain lower level qualifications such as the MSc, and PGDip and PGCert if certain aspects of the first year are successfully completed. (Programme specification document P1)” The visitors were concerned that while it was clear for trainees the full programme award led to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register it was not clear that these exit awards did not lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register. The information about the exit awards should be more clearly communicated to trainees once on the programme so they have all the information about their programme available. For clarity the visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be revised to clearly include this information.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to include information regarding the aegrotat award policies in place.

Reason: The HPC Standards of education and training mapping document provided prior to the visit clearly stated that the programme does not advertise for aegrotat awards. Along with this, other documentation which was submitted did not make reference to aegrotat awards. The information about the aegrotat awards should be more clearly communicated to trainees once on the programme so they have all the information about their programme available. For clarity the visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be revised to clearly include this information.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the requirement for the appointment of at least one external

examiner who must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the university assessment regulations submitted prior to the visit there was no mention of the arrangement that recruitment for the post of external examiner for the programme needed to meet this standard. The visitors were satisfied the external examiner at the time of the visit fulfilled this standard however were concerned this requirement was not communicated widely enough. The visitors were aware it is unlikely to be able to add a statement reflecting this standard into university wide assessment regulations but for clarity require the education provider to revise the programme documentation to include clear reference to this standard of education and training.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider implementing a system for obtaining anonymous feedback on the programme from trainees.

Reason: Discussions at the visit with the programme team indicated they felt the feedback process was working in that feedback gained from trainees was direct and they were able to act on it appropriately. Additional feedback information provided prior to the visit and discussions with the trainees at the visit indicated trainees were reluctant to give in-depth open feedback to the programme team because of concerns that they might be victimised for commenting negatively. The visitors felt that the feedback gained was from a minority of the overall 3 year programme but agreed named feedback could raise these issues. The visitors were content this standard was met but wish to note they support the collation of feedback as it is a valuable resource for the programme team. The visitors suggest the education provider consider implementing a system for obtaining anonymous feedback from trainees –such as asking for typed feedback to be submitted to an impartial administrator from another school who would anonymize data and send back to the programme, this would allow the programme team to have a better understanding of the feedback given and help them use it more effectively.

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Recommendation: The education provider should continue with their developmental work in ensuring placement settings are safe and supportive.

Reason: The discussions at the visit revealed the education provider was making new developments to the ways in which it works with placements. They had recently recruited a new placement co-ordinator. This new person had implemented new procedures and schemes and was spoken very highly of by trainees and the placement supervisor at the meetings. The visitors were satisfied this standard was met and wish to support the new development to the placement processes and hope the education provider continues to develop the way the placements are worked with to ensure the placements continue to provide safe and supportive environments.

David Packwood
Andrew Richards

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Institute of Education, University of London
Programme name	Doctorate in Professional Educational, Child and Adolescent Psychology (DEdPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Educational psychologist
Date of visit	16 – 17 June 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Educational psychologist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health 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 26 July 2010 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 26 August 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept 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 30 July 2010. 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 26 August 2010.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner psychologist profession came onto the register in July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The professional body and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Trevor Holme (Educational psychologist) Judith Bamford (Educational psychologist)
HPC executive officers (in attendance)	Ben Potter
Proposed student numbers	11
Initial approval	January 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Sue Hallam (Institute of Education)
Secretary	Gill Hinson (Institute of Education)
Members of the joint panel	Kairen Cullen (British Psychological Society) Margaret Tunbridge (British Psychological Society) Tara Midgen (British Psychological Society) Rupal Nathwani (British Psychological Society) Laura Clarke (British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured 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 their 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 4 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. 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 is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme.

Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

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 relevant programme documentation, including online information, to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation submitted by the education provider contained instances of inconsistent use of terminology in relation to the statutory regulation of the programme. The visitors noted that there were some instances of the British Psychological Society (BPS) being referred to as the regulatory body for the profession (Year 1 Handbook, p18) or suggesting that meeting the BPS professional standards (Portfolio Guidelines, p17) or standards of conduct performance and ethics (Fitness to Practice Policy, p12 -13) would be sufficient to practice as an educational psychologist. Some information (Year 1 Handbook, p23; Programme Specification, p3 and p8) was unclear as to the relationship between completion of the programme and registration in that it implies that registration is automatic upon completion. HPC approval of a programme does not automatically lead to HPC registration for students who successfully complete the programme; rather it leads to 'eligibility to apply for HPC registration'.

The visitors also noted in discussion with the programme team that the documentation was being updated as a matter of course. However, the visitors considered some of the terminology and the omission of some of the requirements for HPC Registration and ability to work as an Educational psychologist could be misleading to applicants and students. The visitors therefore require the documentation and online information to be reviewed to remove any instances of inconsistent or out of date terminology to ensure that the programme continues to meet this standard.

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 revisit the relevant programme documentation, specifically the physical and online advertising material, to ensure that applicants are aware of the English language requirements of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided and in discussion with the programme team that the programme does place an English language requirement on applicants wishing to take up a place on the programme. This is set out in the Doctoral School Programme Specification (p15) and in the Programme Regulations (p2) at International English Language Testing System (IELTS) 7 or above with no score in any section lower than 7. However, the visitors stated that there was no mention of this requirement in the advertising material for the programme beyond 'effective communication both written and

oral'. The visitors felt that this may be misleading for applicants and that a more explicit reference to the IELTS requirement was necessary. The visitors therefore require evidence that applicants are made aware of the reading, writing, and spoken English requirement before deciding to take up a place on the programme to ensure this standard continues to be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the relevant programme documentation to ensure that applicants are aware of the implications of the 'Fitness to Practice Policy' applied by the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation and in discussion with the programme team that the 'Fitness to Practice Policy' of the programme requires students to disclose any significant issues pertaining to their health and subsequent ability to complete the programme. However the visitors could not find any references to the policy's requirement in the advertising material or documentation provided to applicants prior to them taking up a place on the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence that applicants are made aware of the requirements of the programme's 'Fitness to Practice Policy' to ensure that applicants are aware of the possible requirements and that the programme continues to meet this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. The visitors were happy with the external examiner arrangements after discussions with the programme team. However this standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme must state that any external examiner appointed to the programme needs to be appropriately registered or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. Therefore the visitors require evidence that HPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiner to the programme have been included in the documentation, specifically in the programme regulations, to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend that the education provider notifies the HPC using the major change process when the academic regulations concerning the conferment of aegrotat awards are changed.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and also in conversation with the senior management team that the programme does not confer aegrotat awards. Therefore the visitors were satisfied that the SET was met. However in further discussions with the senior management team it was highlighted that the regulations regarding the awarding of aegrotat awards are to change in the future. From the information provided at the visit it appeared that the proposed change would not affect the ability to meet this standard but would like to highlight that the approval process can not approve prospective changes such as this. Therefore the visitors recommend that when the changes to the regulations occur that these changes are communicated to the HPC using the HPC's major change process.

Judith Bamford
Trevor Holme

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	1 – 2 July 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	9

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' or 'Physical therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health 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 11 August 2010 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 26 August 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept 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 13 August 2010. 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 21 October 2010.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - curriculum and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HPC 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 HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC'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 of HPC visitors and profession	Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	33
Initial approval	1 September 1995
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	20 September 2010
Chair	John Hawker (Leeds Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Jess Owens (Leeds Metropolitan University) Alison Bohan (Leeds Metropolitan University)
Members of the joint panel	Jennifer Duthie (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy) Nina Paterson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy) Alison Caswell (Internal panel member) Julia Lawrence (Internal panel member) Claire Arditto (External panel member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured 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 their 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 6 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. 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 is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

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 all programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme (including the website) to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation and to follow the guidance provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider did not always fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. The visitors require that the documentation is reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology. In particular the visitors noted that the documentation stipulated that 1000 hours of practice are required for registration with the HPC. The HPC do not set a specified number of hours to be completed for placement, therefore this needs to be clearly stated as a professional body requirement to prevent any confusion. The documentation also referred to CPR training guidance from the HPC. The education provider must ensure that references to the roles and requirements of professional bodies and regulatory bodies are accurate and up-to-date.

It should also be made clear throughout all documentation that HPC approval of a programme does not automatically lead to HPC registration for those who complete the programme or ‘eligibility to practice’ but rather to ‘eligibility to apply for HPC registration’. Finally the term ‘state registration’ is no longer in use and so needs to be removed from the programme documentation.

In order to provide students with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme and to prevent confusion for students on the programme the programme documentation must be amended.

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 revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials for the programme, to clearly and consistently articulate the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) standard or equivalent required for entry on to the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted prior to the visit the visitors noted that the IELTS level for entry on to the programme was stated as 6.5 with no skill below 6.0. Prior to the visit the education provider submitted an amended admissions profile which stated the IELTS average score required was 7.0 with no skill below 6.5. This change in the requirement was confirmed in discussions with the programme team.

The visitors require the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to be revised to clearly state the IELTS requirement for entry on to the programme consistently throughout all documentation to ensure that applicants and the education provider are fully aware of the required criteria.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and update the content to reflect the changes made to the programme and ensure documents referenced are current.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted before the visit it was apparent that the programme documentation required some updating to reflect changes made to the programme and to ensure the documents referenced throughout are current. In particular the visitors noted that there were instances where the most recent version of the HPC standards of proficiency (SOPs) was not referenced. The visitors were concerned that this could direct students to out of date information.

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 visitors require that the programme team reviews the information provided on the attendance policy and requirements to ensure that all parties involved are clear about the requirements.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that the attendance requirements for the programme were being amended from a level of 80% to an expectation of 100% attendance. The visitors noted that the information contained in the programme documentation on attendance was potentially confusing. From discussions with the programme team the requirements and expectations were clarified. The visitors require that the programme documentation is revisited to include clearer guidelines for students and the education provider on the attendance requirements for the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the policy on aegrotat awards, and demonstrate how this information is clearly communicated to the students.

Reason: From the documentation provided there was insufficient detail regarding the policy for aegrotat awards for the programme. The visitors need to see evidence that this policy is clearly communicated within the documentation, so

that it is clear that aegrotat awards would not enable students to be eligible to apply to the Register to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy. The visitors were happy with the external examiner arrangements for the programme but need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend that the programme team strengthen the links to further information regarding some of the entry requirements for applicants.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors found that whilst the Criminal Records Bureau checks and health requirements were mentioned in the advertising material for the programme further information on these requirements was not included. The visitors also noted that this was the case with the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy. The visitors felt that applicants would benefit from having clearer links to information on these areas in order to help applicants make an informed choice on the programme.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend that the programme team considers referencing the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics throughout the programme documentation.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that whilst the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics were referred to in areas of the programme documentation this referencing was not always consistent. The visitors felt that students would benefit from further references to this document wherever appropriate, and for these to be linked to the references to the Chartered Society of Physiotherapists and the education providers conduct requirements and guidelines.

Fleur Kitsell
Karen Harrison

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Clinical psychologist
Date of visit	12 – 13 May

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	13

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Clinical psychologist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health 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 12 July 2010 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 26 August 2010 at this meeting, the Committee will accept 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 20 July 2010. 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 26 August 2010

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner psychologist profession came onto the register in 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC'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 of HPC visitors and profession	Harry Brick (Clinical Psychologist) Alison Nicholls (Dietitian)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ben Potter
Proposed student numbers	15
Initial approval	January 1996
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Jill Morgan (Teesside University)
Secretary	John Holmes (Teesside University) Yvonne Ditchburn (Teesside University)
Members of the joint panel	Jane Johnstone (Internal Panel Member) Fiona Terry (Internal Panel Member) Liz Holey (Internal Panel Member) Susan Cleary (Internal Panel Member) Gordon Mitchell (Internal Panel Member) Allan Winthrop (Internal Panel Member) Alison Guy (Internal Panel Member) Steve Green (Internal Panel Member) Chrissie Blackburn (External Panel Member)

	Myra Cooper (External Panel Member) Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society) Steve Davies (British Psychological Society) Francis Blumenfeld (British Psychological Society) Mary O'Reilly (British Psychological Society) Posy Knights (British Psychological Society)
--	--

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval the visitors must be assured 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 their 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 47 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 10 SETs. Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. 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 is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

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 programme documentation and any advertising material to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC 'accrediting' the programme. The HPC does not 'accredit' education programmes instead we 'approve' education programmes. The visitors considered the terminology to be misleading to applicants and students and therefore required the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the procedures relating to selection and entry criteria, particularly the process enacted for checking applicants for criminal convictions, is clearly stated.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the education provider had in place clear admissions procedures and entry criteria in relation to the programme, including a clear process for checking applicants for previous criminal convictions. However, the processes as detailed within the documentation did not consistently state that this was to be an 'enhanced' criminal records bureau (CRB) check and the visitors felt this could be misleading for applicants. The visitors therefore required the education provider to revise their documentation to accurately reflect that any CRB check was to be an 'enhanced' check as described by the programme team during the visit.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the procedures relating to selection and entry criteria, particularly selection and entry criteria, regarding compliance with any health requirements, is clearly stated.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the education provider had in place clear admissions procedures and entry criteria in relation to the programme, including a clear process for applying health checks. However in discussion with the programme team it was clear that the first document a potential applicant would receive stating the need for them to undergo a health check would be the letter offering them a place on the programme. The visitors felt this could be misleading for applicants as none of

the advertising materials made reference to the need for a health check and it could affect a potential students' decision to apply to the programme. The visitors therefore required the education provider to revise their advertising material and documentation to accurately reflect that applicants need to undergo a health check before successfully taking up a place on the 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 revise the programme documentation to identify the mandatory attendance requirements and the associated attendance policy for the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit had only one section regarding attendance for the students. The section stated "Trainees who are unable to progress because of less than 56 days attendance in each placement will be required to undertake either the whole or part of the clinical experience again..." and identified that attendance would be monitored, recorded and the professional suitability process would deal with poor attendance (programme handbook p17). There was no further mention of attendance in the documentation. In discussion with students the visitors noted that there was an assumption that there was an informal mandatory attendance level of 80%. This was contradicted in discussion with the programme team who suggested that 100% attendance was expected. The visitors were also unable to identify any courses of action that would take place prior to the instigation of the professional suitability process if this level was not met. This could lead to students assuming a required level which could lead to academic appeals when decisions around attendance are taken. The visitors therefore require revised programme documentation to identify any mandatory attendance requirements and the associated attendance policy for the programme.

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 revise and resubmit the HPC Standards of Proficiency (SOP) mapping document of the programme to clearly reference how the learning outcomes of the programme allow students to meet the following standards of proficiency;

- **2b.2 understand therapeutic techniques and processes as applied when working with a range of individuals in distress including those who experience difficulties related to anxiety, mood, adjustment to adverse circumstances or life-events, eating, psychosis, use of substances, and those with somatoform, psychosexual, developmental, personality, cognitive and neurological presentations.**
- **2b.5 be able to maintain records appropriately**
 - **be able to keep accurate, legible records and recognise the need to handle these records and all other information in**

- **accordance with applicable legislation, protocols and guidelines**
 - **understand the need to use only accepted terminology in making**
- **3a.1 know and understand the key concepts of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to their profession-specific practice**
 - **understand the structure and function of the human body, relevant to their practice, together with a knowledge of health, disease, disorder and dysfunction**
 - **understand psychological models related to a range of presentations including:**
 - **clients with presentations from acute to enduring and mild to severe;**
 - **problems with biological or neuropsychological causation; and**
 - **problems with mainly psychosocial factors including problems of coping, adaptation and resilience to adverse circumstances and life events, including bereavement and other chronic physical and mental health conditions**
 - **understand psychological models related to working:**
 - **with individual clients, couples, families, carers, groups and at the organisational and community level; and**
 - **in a variety of settings including in-patient or other residential facilities with high-dependency needs, secondary health care, and community or primary care**
 - **understand the impact of psychopharmacological and other clinical interventions on psychological work with clients**

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider it was clear that the cross-referencing mapping document of the programme to HPC Standards of Proficiency had errors in the referencing. This affected SOPs 2b.2 and 2b.5 as the mapping did not make clear where the learning was delivered which would allow students to meet these SOPs. SOP 3a.1 was similarly unclear as to where they were delivered as the references provided linked to psychological theories and the organisational structure of the NHS rather than specific knowledge of the human body. Other parts of SOP 3a.1 also need to be clarified. The visitors require the programme's SOP mapping to be updated to correctly and clearly reference where the learning outcomes of the modules allow students to meet the SOPs so it can be clearly seen that those who successfully complete the programme meet all standards of proficiency for their part of the Register

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition: The education provider must include references to the HPC guidance on conduct performance and ethics alongside references to professional body ethical guidance and also include it in relevant module reading lists.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussions with students that standards of conduct performance and ethics are dealt with in the curriculum. However they also noted in the documentation that references to HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics were not prevalent and the Guidance on conduct and ethics for students did not appear in module reading lists. In discussion with the students it was clear that they did not understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation includes specific references to HPC's standards of conduct performance and ethics especially where the professional body's standards are mentioned. They also require evidence to demonstrate that the student guidance on the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics is included in relevant reading lists to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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 review the programme documentation to make explicit that where the learning outcomes allow students to meet the following HPC Standards of Proficiency they are adequately assessed;

- **2b.2 understand therapeutic techniques and processes as applied when working with a range of individuals in distress including those who experience difficulties related to anxiety, mood, adjustment to adverse circumstances or life-events, eating, psychosis, use of substances, and those with somatoform, psychosexual, developmental, personality, cognitive and neurological presentations.**
- **2b.5 be able to maintain records appropriately**
 - **be able to keep accurate, legible records and recognise the need to handle these records and all other information in accordance with applicable legislation, protocols and guidelines**
 - **understand the need to use only accepted terminology in making**
- **3a.1 know and understand the key concepts of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to their profession-specific practice**
 - **understand the structure and function of the human body, relevant to their practice, together with a knowledge of health, disease, disorder and dysfunction**
 - **understand psychological models related to a range of presentations including:**
 - **clients with presentations from acute to enduring and mild to severe;**
 - **problems with biological or neuropsychological causation; and**
 - **problems with mainly psychosocial factors including problems of coping, adaptation and resilience to adverse circumstances and life events, including**

bereavement and other chronic physical and mental health conditions

- **understand psychological models related to working:**
 - **with individual clients, couples, families, carers, groups and at the organisational and community level; and**
 - **in a variety of settings including in-patient or other residential facilities with high-dependency needs, secondary health care, and community or primary care**
- **understand the impact of psychopharmacological and other clinical interventions on psychological work with clients**

Reason: As in SET4.1 the visitors noted that the cross-referencing mapping document of the programme to HPC Standards of Proficiency had errors in the referencing. This affected SOPs 2b.2, 2b.5, and 3a.1 which means that students completing the programme may not meet the relevant standards of proficiency. The visitors require the programme team to demonstrate how the learning outcomes which enable students to meet these SOPs are assessed which in turn ensuring that students meet these SOPs when completing the programme.

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that any exit awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone achieving an exit award other than the Doctorate in Clinical Psychology would not be eligible to apply for registration with the HPC. However in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail regarding the policy for any exit awards from the programme. Therefore visitors need to see evidence that the policy is clearly articulated and that any exit award would not enable students to be eligible to apply to the Register, to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that aegrotat awards were not awarded to students on this programme. However in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail regarding the policy for aegrotat awards. This could lead to the assumption that the education provider regulations supersede the programme specific regulations and that an aegrotat award may be conferred. Therefore visitors need to see evidence that this policy is clearly communicated within the programme documentation, so that it is clear that aegrotat awards would not enable students

to be eligible to apply to the Register to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy. The visitors were happy with the external examiner arrangements for the programme but need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Recommendations

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider providing clearer signposting to the student complaints process.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation and in discussion with the programme team that there is a comprehensive education provider wide student complaints process. The visitors are therefore satisfied that the SET is met. However the visitors identified in discussion with the students that awareness of the process was not high. To increase awareness of the process the visitors recommend that it is clearly signposted to students rather than the general website link being provided. This could then ensure that students are able to access any required information about the complaints process quickly and easily.

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

Recommendation: That the education provider should consider monitoring the training undertaken by practice placement educators and consider providing additional encouragement to undertake the refresher training provided.

Reason: The visitors noted in discussions with the practice placement providers and programme team that the education provider provides regular training days at the University for practice placement educators. They also noted that all practice placement educators have undergone some form of training prior to supervising a student. The visitors are therefore satisfied that the SET is met. However, to maintain consistency across practice placements, the visitors consider that the efforts to encourage practice placement educators to undertake refresher training should be monitored and additional encouragement could be targeted at those practice placement educators who have not undertaken training recently.

Alison Nicholls
Harry Brick

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality / domain	Therapeutic radiography
Date of visit	19 – 21 May 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 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 'Therapeutic radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 16 July 2010 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 26 August 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept 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 23 July 2010. 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 26 August 2010.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC 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 following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy, Graduate Diploma Radiotherapy and Oncology, Graduate Diploma Diagnostic Imaging and BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging.

The education provider, the professional body and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body; outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Linda Mutema (Radiographer) Russell Hart (Radiographer)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	30
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2010
Chair	Richard Eke (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Secretary	Wendy Hopkins (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Members of the joint panel	Geraldine Francis (External Panel Member) Martin West (External Panel Member) Graham Morgan (Society and College of Radiographers) Hazel Colyer (Society and College of Radiographers) Helen Millican (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

The HPC met with students from the currently approved BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy 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 standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their 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 4 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. 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 is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

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 advertising material on the website to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: The website information submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC providing a “licence to practice” for Students who complete the programme. The HPC does not provide a “licence to practice”; instead they are eligible to apply to the HPC for registration as a radiographer. The visitors considered the terminology to be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require programme and advertising documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout.

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 revisit all relevant instances in submitted programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the English-language entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted it was not clear what the English-language requirements were on entry to the programme. It was also not apparent what International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level was applicable on entry to the programme. At the visit, discussions with the programme team indicated that this should be level 7 overall with no less than 6.5 in any area. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation clearly states the English-language requirements on entry to the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

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 clearly articulate the protocols used to gain consent from students when they are participating in practical or clinical teaching as a patient or client.

Reason: From the discussion with the programme team, it was clarified that students are asked to complete a student informed consent form and that this allows them to choose not to participate as a patient or client. However from the documentation received and reviewed by the visitors, and at the meeting with the programme team it was unclear how consent was obtained and whether this was clearly explained to students. Due to the lack of clarity in the documentation, the visitors felt that it must be updated to clearly articulate the protocols used to gain

consent from students when they are participating in practical or clinical teaching as a patient or client.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy. The visitors were happy with the external examiner arrangements for the programme after discussions with the programme team, but need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Linda Mutema
Russell Hart

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme name	Graduate Diploma Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality / domain	Therapeutic radiography
Date of visit	19 – 21 May 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 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 'Therapeutic radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 16 July 2010 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 26 August 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept 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 23 July 2010. 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 26 August 2010.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC 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 following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Graduate Diploma Diagnostic Imaging and BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging.

The education provider, the professional body and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body; outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Linda Mutema (Radiographer) Russell Hart (Radiographer)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	Student numbers to be taken from the 30 commissioned numbers for the BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology if there are applicants
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2010
Chair	Richard Eke (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Secretary	Wendy Hopkins (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Members of the joint panel	Geraldine Francis (External Panel Member) Martin West (External Panel Member) Graham Morgan (Society and College of Radiographers) Hazel Colyer (Society and College of Radiographers)

	Helen Millican (Internal Panel Member)
--	--

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

The HPC met with students from the currently approved BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy 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 standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their 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 4 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. 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 is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

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 advertising material on the website to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: The website information submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC providing a “licence to practice” for students who complete the programme. The HPC does not provide a “licence to practice”; instead they are eligible to apply to the HPC for registration as a radiographer. The visitors considered the terminology to be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require programme and advertising documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout.

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 revisit all relevant instances in submitted programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the English-language entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted it was not clear what the English-language requirements were on entry to the programme. It was also not apparent what International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level was applicable on entry to the programme. At the visit, discussions with the programme team indicated that this should be level 7 overall with no less than 6.5 in any area. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation clearly states the English-language requirements on entry to the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

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 clearly articulate the protocols used to gain consent from students when they are participating in practical or clinical teaching as a patient or client.

Reason: From the discussion with the programme team, it was clarified that students are asked to complete a student informed consent form and that this allows them to choose not to participate as a patient or client. However from the documentation received and reviewed by the visitors, and at the meeting with the programme team it was unclear how consent was obtained and whether this was clearly explained to students. Due to the lack of clarity in the documentation, the visitors felt that it must be updated to clearly articulate the protocols used to gain

consent from students when they are participating in practical or clinical teaching as a patient or client.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy. The visitors were happy with the external examiner arrangements for the programme after discussions with the programme team, but need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Linda Mutema
Russell Hart

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality / domain	Diagnostic radiography
Date of visit	19 – 21 May 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 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 HPC keep a register of health 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 16 July 2010 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 26 August 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept 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 23 July 2010. 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 26 August 2010.

Introduction

The HPC 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 HPC 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 following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Graduate Diploma Radiotherapy and Oncology and Graduate Diploma Diagnostic Imaging.

The education provider, the professional body and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body; outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Linda Mutema (Radiographer) Russell Hart (Radiographer)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	58
Initial approval	September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Richard Eke (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Secretary	Wendy Hopkins (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Members of the joint panel	Geraldine Francis (External Panel Member) Martin West (External Panel Member) Graham Morgan (Society and College of Radiographers) Hazel Colyer (Society and College of

	Radiographers) Helen Millican (Internal Panel Member)
--	---

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured 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 their 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 4 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. 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 is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

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 advertising material on the website to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: The website information submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC providing a “licence to practice” for students who complete the programme. The HPC does not provide a “licence to practice”, instead they are eligible to apply to the HPC for registration as a radiographer. The visitors considered the terminology to be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require programme and advertising documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout.

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 revisit all relevant instances in submitted documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that the English-language entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted it was not clear what the English-language requirements were on entry to the programme. It was also not apparent what International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level was applicable on entry to the programme. At the visit, discussions with the programme team indicated that this should be level 7 overall with no less than 6.5 in any area. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation clearly states the English-language requirements on entry to the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

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 clearly articulate the protocols used to gain consent from students when they are participating in practical or clinical teaching as a patient or client.

Reason: From the discussion with the programme team, it was clarified that students are asked to complete a student informed consent form and that this allows them to choose not to participate as a patient or client. However from the documentation received and reviewed by the visitors, and at the meeting with the programme team it was unclear how consent was obtained and whether this was clearly explained to students. Due to the lack of clarity in the documentation, the visitors felt that it must be updated to clearly articulate the protocols used to gain

consent from students when they are participating in practical or clinical teaching as a patient or client.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy. The visitors were happy with the external examiner arrangements for the programme after discussions with the programme team, but need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Linda Mutema
Russell Hart

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme name	Graduate Diploma Diagnostic Imaging
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality / domain	Diagnostic radiography
Date of visit	19 – 21 May 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 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 HPC keep a register of health 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 16 July 2010 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 26 August 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept 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 23 July 2010. 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 26 August 2010.

Introduction

The HPC 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 HPC 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 following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Graduate Diploma Radiotherapy and Oncology and BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging

The education provider, the professional body and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body; outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Linda Mutema (Radiographer) Russell Hart (Radiographer)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	Student numbers to be taken from the 58 commissioned numbers for the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging if there are applicants
Initial approval	September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Richard Eke (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Secretary	Wendy Hopkins (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Members of the joint panel	Geraldine Francis (External Panel Member) Martin West (External Panel Member)

	Graham Morgan (Society and College of Radiographers) Hazel Colyer (Society and College of Radiographers) Helen Millican (Internal Panel Member)
--	---

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured 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 their 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 4 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. 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 is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

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 advertising material on the website to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: The website information submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC providing a “licence to practice” for Students who complete the programme. The HPC does not provide a “licence to practice”; instead they are eligible to apply to the HPC for registration as a radiographer. The visitors considered the terminology to be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require programme and advertising documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout.

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 revisit all relevant instances in submitted programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the English-language entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted it was not clear what the English-language requirements were on entry to the programme. It was also not apparent what International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level was applicable on entry to the programme. At the visit, discussions with the programme team indicated that this should be level 7 overall with no less than 6.5 in any area. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation clearly states the English-language requirements on entry to the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

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 clearly articulate the protocols used to gain consent from students when they are participating in practical or clinical teaching as a patient or client.

Reason: From the discussion with the programme team, it was clarified that students are asked to complete a student informed consent form and that this allows them to choose not to participate as a patient or client. However from the documentation received and reviewed by the visitors, and at the meeting with the programme team it was unclear how consent was obtained and whether this was clearly explained to students. Due to the lack of clarity in the documentation, the visitors felt that it must be updated to clearly articulate the protocols used to gain

consent from students when they are participating in practical or clinical teaching as a patient or client.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy. The visitors were happy with the external examiner arrangements for the programme after discussions with the programme team, but need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Linda Mutema
Russell Hart

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	19 – 21 May 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	9
Commendations	10

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 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 HPC keep a register of health 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 16 July 2010 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 26 August 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept 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 23 July 2010. 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 26 August 2010.

Introduction

The HPC 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 HPC 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 following programmes - Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging, Graduate Diploma Diagnostic Imaging, BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Graduate Diploma Radiotherapy and Oncology, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy.

The education provider, the professional body and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Margaret Hanson (Occupational Therapist) Jane Grant (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	45 per cohort once a year across the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and the Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy programmes
Initial approval	September 2006
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Richard Eke (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Secretary	Wendy Hopkins (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Members of the joint panel	Carolyn Bromfield (Internal Panel Member)

	Heidi Von Kurthy (External Panel Member) Sally Feaver (College of Occupational Therapists) Michaela Higginson (College of Occupational Therapists) Clair Parkin (College of Occupational Therapists) Helen Millican (Internal Panel Member)
--	---

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured 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 their 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 52 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 be recommended for ongoing approval. 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 is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

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 resubmit all relevant instances in submitted programme documentation, including online information, to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation and gives the accurate information about applying to the Register.

Reason: The documentation submitted provided contained instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to the registered status of individuals namely “licence to practice” (Contextual Documentation for Validation, Programme Specification, Response to Preliminary Scrutiny Report, Professional Practice Portfolio, Programme Handbook). The online information (as of 18 May 2010) was unclear as to the relationship between completion of the programme and registration in that it implies that registration is automatic upon completion. The visitors considered the terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the documentation and online information to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out of date terminology.

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 revisit all relevant instances in programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the English-language entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted it was not clear what the English-language requirements were on entry to the programme. It was also not apparent what International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level was applicable on entry to the programme. At the visit, discussions with the programme team indicated that this should be level 7 overall with no less than 6.5 for any area. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation clearly states the English language requirements on entry to the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit a revised Practice Placement Portfolio that ensures references to HPC requirements are accurate.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit (Practice Placement Portfolio – Section 8) had a statement which stated “The Health Professions Council requires you to have completed 1000 hours of professional practice prior

to registering". The Health Professions Council does not make this a requirement to register and this therefore gives students incorrect information. The visitors therefore require the education provider submits programme specific documentation that does not make this statement for students in this important resource.

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 submit a revised programme handbook that clearly shows the consent procedures for students.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit had a consent form included in the appendices but not in the programme handbook. Other documentation stated that the consent form could be found in the programme handbook. Discussions with the students indicated they were not fully aware of having given their consent to participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching. After discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied the education provider had a consent protocol to use however in light of the above were not satisfied the consent protocols were communicated effectively to students. The visitors therefore require the education provider to resubmit a revised programme handbook which includes the education provider's consent form and associated processes to make the process and the implications more explicit and accessible for students.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy. The visitors were happy with the external examiner arrangements for the programme after discussions with the programme team, but need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Recommendations

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revising the programme documentation to include references to the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics and guidance on conduct and ethics for students alongside references to professional body ethical standards and in relevant module reading lists

Reason: The programme documentation provided prior to the visit made no explicit reference to the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The professional body's Code of Ethics was heavily referenced throughout. The visitors were satisfied the programme's curriculum and documentation made sure students understood the implications of HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors recommend to further embed the standards within the learning, where references are made to the professional body's Code of Ethics, the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics and Guidance on conduct and ethics for students also be referenced, and included in relevant module reading lists.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the training they use for practice placement educators.

Reason: During the visit, discussions with the practice placement educators indicated they were not entirely satisfied with the training requirements as currently held by the education provider. It was discussed that the training requirements had recently changed to a new system which posed problems for practice placement educators with accessing the training and therefore utilising it fully. The visitors were satisfied this SET was met but recommend the education provider review the training they use to ensure practice placement educators are not alienated by the training currently offered or discouraged from offering student places to the programme.

Commendations

The visitors wish to commend the following aspects of the programme:

Commendation: The visitors wish to commend the 'Widening Occupation Weeks (WOW)' that the education provider holds in the first year.

Reason: The WOW initiative that has been brought into the programme allocates students as volunteers for two weeks in their first year onto local community projects. The visitors felt this experience underpinned the learning experience and enhanced the students understanding of the theoretical application of 'occupation' in the community with a shared experience of engaging in 'meaningful occupation'. They felt it was extremely beneficial for students to actively engage directly in the community in such a way and would give them opportunities to experience occupation in ways not provided directly through the programme which would increase their experience and confidence. The visitors felt this was indicative of best practice.

Jane Grant
Margaret Hanson

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme name	Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	19 – 21 May 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	9
Commendations	10

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 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 HPC keep a register of health 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 16 July 2010 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 26 August 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept 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 23 July 2010. 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 26 August 2010.

Introduction

The HPC 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 HPC 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 following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging, Graduate Diploma Diagnostic Imaging, BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Graduate Diploma Radiotherapy and Oncology, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy.

The education provider, the professional body and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Margaret Hanson (Occupational Therapist) Jane Grant (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	45 per cohort once a year across the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and the Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy programmes
Initial approval	September 2006
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Richard Eke (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Secretary	Wendy Hopkins (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Members of the joint panel	Carolyn Bromfield (Internal Panel Member)

	Heidi Von Kurthy (External Panel Member) Sally Feaver (College of Occupational Therapists) Michaela Higginson (College of Occupational Therapists) Clair Parkin (College of Occupational Therapists) Helen Millican (Internal Panel Member)
--	---

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured 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 their 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 52 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 be recommended for ongoing approval. 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 is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

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 resubmit all relevant instances in submitted programme documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted by the education provider used incorrect terminology in relation to statutory regulation. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC providing a “licence to practice” for graduates of the programme ” (Contextual Documentation for Validation, Programme Specification, Response to Preliminary Scrutiny Report, Professional Practice Portfolio, Programme Handbook). The HPC does not provide a “licence to practice”, instead graduates are eligible to apply to the HPC for registration as an occupational therapist. The visitors considered the terminology to be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require programme documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout.

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 revisit all relevant instances in programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the English-language entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted it was not clear what the English-language requirements were on entry to the programme. It was also not apparent what International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level was applicable on entry to the programme. At the visit, discussions with the programme team indicated that this should be level 7 overall with no less than 6.5 for any area. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation clearly states the English-language requirements on entry to the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit a revised Practice Placement Portfolio that ensures references to HPC requirements are accurate.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit (Practice Placement Portfolio – Section 8) had a statement which stated “The Health Professions

Council requires you to have completed 1000 hours of professional practice prior to registering". The Health Professions Council does not make this a requirement to register and this therefore gives students incorrect information. The visitors therefore require the education provider submits programme specific documentation that does not make this statement for students in this important resource.

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 submit a revised programme handbook that clearly shows the consent procedures for students.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit had a consent form included in the appendices but not in the programme handbook. Other documentation stated that the consent form could be found in the programme handbook. Discussions with the students indicated they were not fully aware of having given their consent to participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching. After discussions with the programme teams the visitors were satisfied the education provider had a consent protocol to use however in light of the above were not satisfied the consent protocols would be communicated effectively to students. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit a revised programme handbook which includes the education provider's consent form and associated processes to make the process and the implications more explicit and accessible for students.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy. The visitors were happy with the external examiner arrangements for the programme after discussions with the programme team, but need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Recommendations

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revising the programme documentation to include references to the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics and guidance on conduct and ethics for students alongside references to professional body ethical standards and in relevant module reading lists

Reason: The programme documentation provided prior to the visit made no explicit reference to the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The professional body's Code of Ethics was heavily referenced throughout. The visitors were satisfied the programme's curriculum and documentation made sure students understood the implications of HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors recommend to further embed the standards within the learning, where references are made to the professional body's Code of Ethics, the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics and Guidance on conduct and ethics for students also be referenced, and included in relevant module reading lists.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the training they use for practice placement educators.

Reason: During the visit, discussions with the practice placement educators indicated they were not entirely satisfied with the training requirements as currently held by the education provider. It was discussed that the training requirements had recently changed to a new system which posed problems for practice placement educators with accessing the training and therefore utilising it fully. The visitors were satisfied this SET was met but recommend the education provider review the training they use to ensure practice placement educators are not alienated by the training currently offered or discouraged from offering student places to the programme.

Commendations

The visitors wish to commend the following aspects of the programme:

Commendation: The visitors wish to commend the 'Widening Occupation Weeks (WOW)' that the education provider holds in the first year.

Reason: The WOW initiative that has been brought into the programme allocates students as volunteers for two weeks in their first year onto local community projects. The visitors felt this experience underpinned the learning experience and enhanced the students understanding of the theoretical application of 'occupation' in the community with a shared experience of engaging in 'meaningful occupation'. They felt it was extremely beneficial for students to actively engage directly in the community in such a way and would give them opportunities to experience occupation in ways not provided directly through the programme which would increase their experience and confidence. The visitors felt this was indicative of best practice.

Jane Grant
Margaret Hanson

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	19 – 21 May 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' or 'Physical therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health 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 16 July 2010 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 26 August 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept 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 23 July 2010. 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 26 August 2010.

Introduction

The HPC 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 HPC 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 following programmes - Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging, Graduate Diploma Diagnostic Imaging, BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Graduate Diploma Radiotherapy and Oncology, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy.

The education provider, the professional body and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Kathleen Bosworth (Physiotherapist) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ben Potter
Proposed student numbers	70
Initial approval	September 2007
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Richard Eke (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Secretary	Wendy Hopkins (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Members of the joint panel	Helen Millican (Internal Panel Member) Elizabeth Evans (External Panel Member) Nina Thompson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Jacqui Potter (Chartered Society of

	Physiotherapists)
--	-------------------

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured 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 their 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 3 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. 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 providers which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all relevant instances in programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the English-language entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted it was not clear what the English-language requirements were on entry to the programme. It was also not apparent what International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level was applicable on entry to the programme. At the visit, discussions with the programme team indicated that this should be level 7 overall with no less than 6.5 for any area. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation clearly states the English-language requirements on entry to the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition: The education provider must include references to the HPC's standards of conduct performance and ethics alongside references to professional body ethical guidance as well as including the HPC Guidance on conduct performance and ethics for students in relevant module reading lists.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussions with students that standards of conduct, performance and ethics are dealt with in the curriculum. In discussion with the students it was clear that they did not understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. They also noted in the documentation that references to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were not prevalent and the HPC's Guidance on conduct performance and ethics for students did not appear in module reading lists. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation includes specific references to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics especially where the professional body's standards are mentioned. They also require evidence to demonstrate that the student guidance on the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics is included in relevant reading lists to enable students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy. The visitors were happy with the external examiner arrangements for the programme but need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to review the training provided for practice placement educators.

Reason: The visitors noted in discussions with the practice placement educators and the programme team that practice placement educator training is provided and that practice placement educators undertake appropriate training prior to supervising a student. Therefore the visitors were satisfied this SET was met. However the visitors noted that the practice placement educators indicated they were not entirely satisfied with the Facilitating Learning and Assessing in Practice (FLAP) training. Because of this the visitors recommend that the education provider continues to explore providing an alternative to the FLAP training for physiotherapy practice placement educators such as the full and half day profession specific training which was mentioned in discussion with the programme team.

Kathryn Heathcote
Kathleen Bosworth

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme name	Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	19 – 21 May 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' or 'Physical therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health 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 16 July 2010 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 26 August 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept 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 23 July 2010. 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 26 August 2010.

Introduction

The HPC 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 HPC 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 following programmes - Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging, Graduate Diploma Diagnostic Imaging, BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Graduate Diploma Radiotherapy and Oncology, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy.

The education provider, the professional body and the HPC 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 HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Kathleen Bosworth (Physiotherapist) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ben Potter
Proposed student numbers	70
Initial approval	September 2007
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Richard Eke (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Secretary	Wendy Hopkins (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Members of the joint panel	Helen Millican (Internal Panel Member) Elizabeth Evans (External Panel Member) Nina Thompson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Jacqui Potter (Chartered Society of

	Physiotherapists)
--	-------------------

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured 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 their 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 3 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. 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 providers which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all relevant instances in programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the English-language entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted it was not clear what the English-language requirements were on entry to the programme. It was also not apparent what International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level was applicable on entry to the programme. At the visit, discussions with the programme team indicated that this should be level 7 overall with no less than 6.5 for any area. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation clearly states the English-language requirements on entry to the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition: The education provider must include references to the HPC's standards of conduct performance and ethics alongside references to professional body ethical guidance as well as including the HPC Guidance on conduct performance and ethics for students in relevant module reading lists.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussions with students that standards of conduct, performance and ethics are dealt with in the curriculum. In discussion with the students it was clear that they did not understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. They also noted in the documentation that references to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were not prevalent and the HPC's Guidance on conduct performance and ethics for students did not appear in module reading lists. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation includes specific references to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics especially where the professional body's standards are mentioned. They also require evidence to demonstrate that the student guidance on the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics is included in relevant reading lists to enable students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy. The visitors were happy with the external examiner arrangements for the programme but need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to review the training provided for practice placement educators.

Reason: The visitors noted in discussions with the practice placement educators and the programme team that practice placement educator training is provided and that practice placement educators undertake appropriate training prior to supervising a student. Therefore the visitors were satisfied this SET was met. However the visitors noted that the practice placement educators indicated they were not entirely satisfied with the Facilitating Learning and Assessing in Practice (FLAP) training. Because of this the visitors recommend that the education provider continues to explore providing an alternative to the FLAP training for physiotherapy practice placement educators such as the full and half day profession specific training which was mentioned in discussion with the programme team.

Kathryn Heathcote
Kathleen Bosworth