

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)
<b>Programme name</b>	Doctorate in Educational Psychology (DEdPsy)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Educational psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	17 – 18 April 2012

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendation .....	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 '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 21 May 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. 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 1 May 2012. 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 5 July 2012.

## 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	Trevor Holme (Educational psychologist) Julie Harrower (Forensic psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	10
First approved intake	September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	David Lloyd (Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd))
Members of the joint panel	Frederika Bradbury (British Psychological Society) John Franey (British Psychological Society) Jeune Guishard-Pine (British Psychological Society) Jean Law (British Psychological Society) Rupal Nathwani (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"/>
Admissions and selection process information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme resources information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme Board and Committee minutes	<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 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can 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.

## Conditions

### **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 clearly state in the programme documentation that interim or exit awards are not in place for this programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors noted the SETs mapping document stated there were no exit or interim awards on the programme. The visitors considered it to be important for students and potential applicants to be aware of this to ensure there is no confusion. The visitors require the programme documentation to be revised to clearly include this information for students and potential applicants.

### **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 clearly state in the programme documentation that aegrotat awards will not be conferred on students from this programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors noted the SETs mapping document stated there was no aegrotat award for this programme. The visitors considered it to be important for students and potential applicants to be aware of this to ensure there is no confusion. The visitors require the programme documentation to be revised to clearly include this information for students and potential applicants.

## Recommendation

### **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 suggest the programme team consider including specific information about the requirement for a good command of reading, writing and spoken English for applicants and potential applicants for the programme.

**Reason:** From documentation and discussion at the visit the visitors were satisfied with the admission procedures and the information provided for applicants and potential applicants. During the admissions procedures the programme team looked for evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English through interview procedures and the written applications. The visitors felt the procedures were communicated well although this particular aspect of the process was not clearly specified. The visitors recommend the programme team consider including information about the requirement for a good command of reading, writing and spoken English with an explanation of why this is important for a programme of this nature to aid the admissions process.

Trevor Holme  
Julie Harrower

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	De Montfort University
<b>Programme name</b>	Aptitude Test
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Flexible
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Hearing aid dispensers
<b>Date of visit</b>	3 – 4 April 2012

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	17
Standards of education and training not applicable to the programme.....	18



## 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 'Hearing aid dispenser' 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 28 May 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. 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 28 September 2012. 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 4 December 2012.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Hearing aid dispenser profession came onto the register in April 2010 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.

The visit also assessed whether a number of standards under SET 5 (Practice placements) were applicable to the programme as a result of entry requirements for prior qualifications and experience as an audiologist working in the NHS.

This visit was an HPC only visit. The education provider and validating body did not validate or review the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Audiology, full time, BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology), full time and Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology, full time. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Tim Pringle (Hearing aid dispenser)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	6 per iteration (up to 35 per annum)
First approved intake	April 2010
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	June 2012
Chair	Debbie Lockton (De Montfort University)
Secretary	Sophia Welton (De Montfort 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Application Form and supporting information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information applicants receive once accepted on to the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review a programme specification prior to the visit as the education provider does not create programme specifications for this award type.

The HPC did not review descriptions of the modules prior to the visit. This programme does not include any teaching so there are no descriptions of the modules.

The HPC did not review a practice placement handbook prior to the visit. This programme does not include any practice placements so there is no practice placement handbook.

The HPC did not review a student handbook prior to the visit as the documentation does not exist.

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports for the last two years prior to the visit. The programme does not have an external examiner.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 did not meet with any placement providers or practice placement educators. This programme does not include any practice placements so there are no placement providers or practice placement educators to meet with.

The HPC met with students from the Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology, BSc (Hons) Audiology and BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology) programme, as students from the programme seeking approval were unable to attend the visit.

## 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 programme can be approved. The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of SETs are not applicable to this education programme and they are not required to be met before ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 18 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 26 SETs. The visitors agreed that 13 of the SETs are not applicable to this programme.

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.

## 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 any advertising materials, to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of HPC regulation.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that elements of the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. The visitors noted that the programme documentation consistently made reference to HPC regulating 'Hearing Aid Audiologists'. The protected title regulated by the HPC is 'hearing aid dispenser', which allows registrants to undertake the protected functions associated with the title. The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the protected title is consistently referred to throughout, as the visitors considered that the incorrect use of terminology could be misleading to applicants and students.

### **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 admissions procedures to apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was not clear what the English-language requirements were for entry to the programme. It was also not clear if, or what, International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level was required for entry to the programme. The visitors require the education provider to revisit programme documentation to clearly state the English-language requirements needed for entry to the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the admissions procedures to apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal conviction checks.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted, the visitors were unable to clarify the procedures in place that ensure the education provider runs appropriate and relevant criminal convictions checks on all applicants to the programme. In order to meet this standard the visitors require the education provider to revisit the admissions procedures to apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal conviction checks.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the admissions procedures to apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was not clear what the health requirements were for entry to the programme. The visitors were unsure how the programme team ensured that they had taken all reasonable steps to keep to any health requirements set and make any reasonable adjustments as part of their admissions procedures. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence regarding the admissions procedures on health requirements to ensure potential applicants and students are fully aware of the requirements for the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the selection and entry criteria to ensure they are appropriate, clear and consistent.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was clear the programme consisted of several competency based assessments and there were no formal teaching or learning approaches in place. The visitors noted students on the programme were assessed against a range of competencies based on prior learning and experience and the programme had no taught curriculum. The education provider evaluated applicants on a case by case basis through the admissions procedures, often using a CV to inform a decision. Applicants were required to demonstrate audiological knowledge, skills and experience equivalent to at least a Foundation Degree level. The education provider used this method in place of the programme having a taught curriculum. The visitors noted the education provider required applicants to meet eight different entry criteria. Some of the admissions criteria appeared to be contradictory, for example, criteria number three related only to international applicants and criteria number eight was only relevant to applicants who had undertaken in-service training. The visitors require the education provider to review the admissions criteria to ensure they are appropriate, clear and consistent.

With this model of programme and admission criterion the visitors expressed concern that the admissions procedures may not ensure absolute consistency. The visitors noted applications were not judged on a competency framework and the education provider did not map evidence against the standards of proficiency. The visitors noted the entry criteria do not ensure that standards of proficiency not assessed within the programme are evidenced through admissions. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the admissions procedures to ensure that academic and professional entry standards are appropriate to the programme and ensure standards of proficiency that are not assessed within the programme are addressed through the admissions procedures.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the selection and entry criteria to ensure they include accreditation of prior (experiential) learning mechanisms.

**Reason:** The visitors noted students on the programme were assessed against a range of competencies based on prior learning and experience and the programme had no taught curriculum. The education provider evaluated applicants on a case by case basis through the admissions procedures, often using a CV to inform a decision. Applicants were required to demonstrate audiological knowledge, skills and experience equivalent to at least a Foundation Degree level. The visitors expressed concern that the admissions procedures may not ensure absolute consistency as applications were not judged on a competency framework and the education provider did not map evidence against the standards of proficiency. The visitors noted the entry criteria do not ensure that standards of proficiency not assessed within the programme are evidenced through admissions. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the selection and entry criteria to ensure they include accreditation of prior (experiential) learning mechanisms and ensure the standards of proficiency that are not assessed within the programme are addressed through the admissions procedures.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate the programme has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was not clear how the education provider regularly monitored or evaluated the programme. The visitors noted discussions with the senior management team indicated the programme was subject to regular monitoring and evaluation systems in line with the education providers quality assurance processes. The visitors were unable to determine how the education provider was able to ensure the programme's effectiveness, adapt the programme in light of student feedback or ensure appropriate standards in the assessment. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate the programme has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place, including mechanisms for gathering student feedback and reviewing external examiners' reports.

## **3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of a system of academic and pastoral support.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was not clear what systems are in place to ensure students are able to access academic and pastoral support. The visitors noted that students are required to complete a range of assessments within the programme and may require academic and



pastoral support. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate that the programme has a system of academic and pastoral support in place.

### **3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that the complaints process is clearly articulated to students.

**Reason:** From a review of programme documentation relating to approval of the BSc (Hons) Audiology, BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology) and Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology programmes the visitors noted that the education provider has an institution wide student complaints process. The visitors were satisfied that this process ensures that students concerns and complaints are dealt with. However, from a review of the documentation submitted for the Aptitude Test, the visitors were unable to find reference to a formal student complaints process. The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the complaints process is clearly articulated to students.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of a formal process for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was not clear what the formal process was for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. The visitors noted that students on the programme undertake a range of practical and theoretical assessments and the education provider has a role in identifying students who may not be fit to practise and help address any concerns about their conduct. The visitors therefore require evidence of a formal process for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

### **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 the programme documentation to demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme consisted of several competency based assessments and no formal teaching or learning approaches were in place. The visitors noted that students on the programme were assessed against a range of competencies based on prior learning and experience and the programme had no taught curriculum. The visitors were unable to determine whether the assessments were mapped against specific learning outcomes. The visitors were also unable to determine how the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency. The visitors require the

education provider to provide evidence that clearly sets out the learning outcomes for the programme that ensure all the specific standards of proficiency are covered within the programme.

#### **4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence that demonstrates that theory and practice are integrated.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme consisted of several competency based assessments and no formal teaching or learning approaches were in place. The visitors noted that students on the programme were assessed against a range of competencies based on prior learning and experience and the programme had no taught curriculum or placements. In light of the programme design the visitors were unable to determine how theory and practice were integrated within the programme. They therefore require further information to show how this standard continues to be 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 demonstrate how the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that 'Section 6' of the programme assessment is framed around HPC standards. The visitors noted that this assessment involves a thirty minute written paper, half of which focuses on the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors could not see how this assessment was sufficient to ensure that all students understand the implications of these standards; including how and where they apply. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to identify how the programme team ensure that students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

#### **4.6 The delivery of the programme must support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how delivery of the programme supports and encourages students to develop skills in autonomous and reflective thinking.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme consisted of several competency based assessments and no formal teaching or learning approaches were in place. The visitors noted that students on the programme were assessed against a range of competencies based on prior learning and experience and the programme had no taught curriculum. The visitors were unable to find evidence of independent and reflective thinking through student-centred learning, teaching and assessment strategies. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how delivery of the

programme supports and encourages students to develop skills in autonomous and reflective thinking.

#### **4.7 The delivery of the programme must encourage evidence based practice.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how delivery of the programme encourages evidence based practice.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme consisted of several competency based assessments and no formal teaching or learning approaches were in place. The visitors noted that students on the programme were assessed against a range of competencies based on prior learning and experience and the programme had no taught curriculum. The visitors were unable to find evidence of evidence based practice through student-centred and independent learning, teaching and assessment strategies. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how delivery of the programme encourages evidence based practice.

#### **4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that the range of learning and teaching approaches used is appropriate to the effective delivery of the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme consisted of several competency based assessments and no formal teaching or learning approaches were in place. The visitors noted that students on the programme were assessed against a range of competencies based on prior learning and experience and the programme had no taught curriculum. The visitors noted that the education provider used the admissions procedures to assess an applicant's prior experience to ensure they have the theoretical knowledge and skills to undertake the assessments within the programme. However, from a review of the admissions procedures, programme documentation and the 'Standards of proficiency mapping document' the visitors were unable to clearly identify where all the standards of proficiency were covered within the programme. The visitors were unable to identify the learning outcomes within the programme and therefore could not determine whether the range of learning and teaching approaches used were appropriate. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate that the range of learning and teaching approaches used is appropriate to the effective delivery of the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure the assessment strategy and design ensures that students who successfully complete the programme have met all the standards of proficiency for hearing aid dispensers.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to determine how the assessment strategy and design ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency. The visitors were unable to identify the learning outcomes that were assessed within the programme and were therefore not able to determine if all the standards of proficiency were covered. The visitors require the education provider to provide evidence that clearly sets out the assessment strategy that includes a direct reference to the learning outcomes and associated assessment methods, to demonstrate that all the standards of proficiency are assessed within the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must articulate how the programme's assessments provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme consisted of several competency based assessments and no formal teaching or learning approaches were in place. The visitors noted that students on the programme were assessed against a range of competencies based on prior learning and experience and the programme had no taught curriculum. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to identify the learning outcomes that were assessed within the programme. The visitors were also unable to determine the level at which the learning outcomes were assessed and therefore were not able to determine if assessments ensure that all the standards of proficiency were covered within the programme. The visitors therefore require detailed documentation, such as an assessment strategy, to articulate how learning outcomes will be assessed at the appropriate level and reflect the requirements of external reference frameworks. The visitors require this evidence to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme have met the relevant learning outcomes and subsequently all of the standards of proficiency.

**6.3 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence that demonstrates that professional aspects of practice are integral to the assessment procedures

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme consisted of several competency based assessments and no formal teaching or learning approaches were in place. The visitors noted that students on the programme were assessed against a range of competencies based on prior learning and experience and the programme had no taught curriculum. From the information provided the visitors were not able to make a clear judgement on whether professional aspects of practice are integral to the assessment procedures. The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how the assessment procedures address professional issues.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that the assessment methods employed measure the learning outcomes.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme consisted of several competency based assessments and no formal teaching or learning approaches were in place. The visitors noted that students on the programme were assessed against a range of competencies based on prior learning and experience and the programme had no taught curriculum. The visitors were unable to identify the learning outcomes that were assessed within the programme and were therefore not able to determine if all the standards of proficiency were covered. The visitors require the education provider to provide evidence that clearly sets out the assessment strategy, that includes a direct reference to the learning outcomes and associated assessment methods, to demonstrate that all the standards of proficiency are assessed within the programme and that those who successfully complete the programme can practise safely and effectively.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that the measure of student performance is objective and ensures fitness to practice.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme consisted of several competency based assessments and no formal teaching or learning approaches were in place. The visitors noted that students on the programme were assessed against a range of competencies based on prior learning and experience and the programme had no taught curriculum. The visitors were unable to identify the learning outcomes that were assessed within the programme and were therefore not able to determine if all the standards of proficiency were covered. The visitors were also unable to determine how the education provider monitored and measured student performance and what criteria were in place to make sure students are fit to practise. The visitors require further information to demonstrate that the measurement of student performance is objective and ensures fitness to practice.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure there are effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was not clear how the programme was monitored or evaluated. The visitors noted discussions with the senior management team where it was stated that the programme was subject to regular monitoring and evaluation systems in line with the education providers quality assurance processes. The visitors were not provided with evidence of

regular monitoring and evaluation systems for the programme. The visitors therefore require information that demonstrates that there are effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place, including internal and external moderation of assessment to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly specify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme consisted of several competency based assessments and no formal teaching or learning approaches were in place. The visitors noted that students on the programme were assessed against a range of competencies based on prior learning and experience and the programme had no taught curriculum. The visitors were unable to identify the learning outcomes that were assessed within the programme and were therefore unable to determine how the education provider made students aware of the requirements of the programme. The visitors require the education provider to clearly specify the requirements for student progression and achievement, information outlining how the education provider decides what prevents a student from progressing on the programme and what the options available to a failing student are.

#### **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 state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must clarify the procedure for the right of appeal for students.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to find reference to an appeals procedure. The visitors were therefore not clear how a student can ask for a review of a decision made on their assessment, progression and achievement. The visitors require further information that clarifies the appeals procedure for students and details of how students are told about the right to appeal to ensure this standard is 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 clarify the arrangements that are in place for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

**Reason:** The visitors were not provided with information relating to an external examiner for the programme. The visitors require further information that outlines the arrangements that are in place for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, are from the relevant part of the Register. If no external examiner is in place the visitors require the education provider to revisit the assessment regulations to specify the requirement for the appointment of an external examiner.

## 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 developing additional programme documentation, including a student handbook.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that it offered limited guidance to applicants and students. The visitors noted that the education provider supplied applicants and students with a brief programme introduction and information about the types of assessment. The visitors considered this documentation to be lacking detail and recommend that the education provider should consider developing additional programme documentation, including a student handbook to give both applicants and students on the programme further information relating to the programme and the education provider.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider revisiting the admissions procedures to develop a more robust approach to evidence applicant's prior experience and qualifications.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the education provider evaluated applicants on a case by case basis through the admissions procedures, often using a CV to inform a decision. The visitors expressed concern that the admissions procedures do not ensure absolute consistency as applications were not judged on a competency framework and the education provider did not map evidence against the standards of proficiency. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider revisiting the admissions procedures to develop a more robust approach to evidence applicant's prior experience and qualifications, including using accreditation of prior learning mechanisms. The visitors noted that the education provider may want to develop a portfolio model that would allow the education provider sign off specific proficiencies and assess student's competence and understanding in greater depth and over a longer timeframe.

### **4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.**

**Condition:** The education provider should consider introducing learning and teaching approaches within the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme consisted of several competency based assessments and no formal teaching or learning approaches were in place. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider introducing teaching and learning approaches within the programme.



Standards of education and training not applicable to the programme

### **5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.**

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that it was expected that applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise with the aim of seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme. The visitors therefore recommend this standard is not applicable to the programme.

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

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that it was expected that applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise with the aim of seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.2 is not applicable to the programme.

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

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that it was expected that applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise with the aim of seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied

that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.3 is not applicable to the programme.

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

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that it was expected that applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise with the aim of seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.4 is not applicable to the programme.

#### **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.**

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that it was expected that applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise with the aim of seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.5 is not applicable to the programme.

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

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that it was expected that applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise with the aim of

seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.6 is not applicable to the programme.

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

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that it was expected that applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise with the aim of seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.7 is not applicable to the programme.

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

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that it was expected that applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise with the aim of seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.8 is not applicable to the programme.

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

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that it was expected applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to

work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise with the aim of seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.9 is not applicable to the programme.

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

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that it was expected that applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise with the aim of seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.10 is not applicable to the programme.

#### **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.**

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that it was expected that applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise with the aim of seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.11 is not applicable to the programme.

### **5.12 Learning, teaching and supervision must encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.**

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that it was expected applicants that to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise with the aim of seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.12 is not applicable to the programme.

### **5.13 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.**

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not incorporate practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that it was expected that applicants to the programme would be practitioners returning to work, competent with working with service users but needing to update their clinical skills. Alternatively, they would be practitioners in practise with the aim of seeking registration as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.13 is not applicable to the programme.

Claire Brewis  
Linda Mutema  
Tim Pringle

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	De Montfort University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Audiology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Hearing aid dispensers
<b>Date of visit</b>	3 – 4 April 2012

## 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 'Hearing aid dispenser' 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 28 May 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. 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 12 July 2012. 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 23 August 2012.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Hearing aid dispenser profession came onto the register in April 2010 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 an HPC only visit. The education provider and validating body did not validate or review the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology), full time, Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology, full time and Aptitude Test, flexible. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Tim Pringle (Hearing aid dispenser)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	30
First approved intake	September 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Debbie Lockton (De Montfort University)
Secretary	Sophia Welton (De Montfort 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 (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 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 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.

## 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 of the programme documentation, and any advertising material, to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of HPC regulation.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that elements of the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of incorrect terminology within the documentation, stating that completion of the programme will enable graduates to register with the HPC. Upon successful completion of the programme all students become eligible to apply for registration with the HPC and as such the language the education provider uses needs to reflect this. The visitors also noted that the programme documentation consistently makes reference to HPC regulating 'Hearing Aid Audiologists'. The HPC protected title regulated by the HPC is 'hearing aid dispenser' which allows registrants to undertake the protected functions associated with the title. The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the protected title is consistently referred to throughout the documentation. The visitors considered that the incorrect use of terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to be amended to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology.

### **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 to clearly highlight what becoming a hearing aid dispenser means, that the HPC is the statutory regulator for the profession and that successful completion of the programme provides to eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted limited reference to the title 'hearing aid dispenser' and the protected functions that are associated with it. The visitors also noted that there was limited reference to the fact that successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration as a hearing aid dispenser with the HPC. The visitors were concerned that the role of a hearing aid dispenser was not clearly highlighted within the programme documentation and that potential applicants as well as students, would be unaware of the future employment options available to them. The visitors also noted limited reference to the role of the HPC as the statutory regulator for hearing aid dispensers. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation to include key information about the option of becoming a hearing aid dispenser. This information should ensure that applicants and students have all of the information

they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme and whether to apply to the HPC Register on successful completion of the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to outline the systems used to ensure that all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

**Reason:** The visitors noted discussions with the programme team which outlined the procedure in place for approving practice placement educators who work in the NHS. The programme team stated that practice placement educators must be band six or above, have a minimum of two years' experience and have attended practice placement educator training. The visitors were satisfied with these criteria, however they were not provided with documentary evidence to support these discussions. The visitors also noted that the education provider utilises practice placement educators who work outside of the NHS. The visitors were less clear about the procedures in place for approving practice placement educators who work in the independent sector. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to include clear formal protocols and an outline of the systems in place to ensure that practice placement educators from within the NHS and independent sector have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience required to supervise a student from this 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 state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation.

## Recommendations

### **3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider developing additional mechanisms to ensure that the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme is able to access additional information and resources specific to hearing aid dispensing.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme is not on the HPC Register. However, the visitors were satisfied that they are appropriately qualified and experienced and that this standard is met. The visitors also noted that the programme maintained links to the profession specific issues associated with hearing aid dispensing through a number of mechanisms, which included inviting hearing aid dispensers to deliver teaching sessions and facilitating independent sector practice placements. Through discussions it was also apparent that the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme has close links with the British Academy of Audiology (BAA) and plans to develop links with the British Society of Hearing Aid Audiologists (BSHAA). The visitors recommend that the education provider continues to explore ways to support the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme in maintaining up to date profession specific knowledge specific to hearing aid dispensing.

### **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 reviewing the programme documentation to further highlight the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team and the students the visitors noted that the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are taught and assessed within the programme. The visitors were therefore satisfied that the curriculum makes sure that students understand the implications of these standards. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that references to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were limited. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to further highlight the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider developing a system for checking the HPC registration details of practice placement educators.

**Reason:** Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted plans to expand the range of practice placements to include non-NHS placements. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider developing a system for checking the HPC registration details of practice placement educators in non-NHS practice placements.

**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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to clearly state that any exit awards from the programme do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team, and a review of the programme documentation the visitors were satisfied that any exit awards from the programme do not contain any reference to the HPC protected title or part of the Register. To provide further clarity the visitors recommend that the education provider should clearly state that any exit awards from the programme do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

Claire Brewis  
Linda Mutema  
Tim Pringle

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	De Montfort University
<b>Programme name</b>	Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Hearing aid dispensers
<b>Date of visit</b>	3 – 4 April 2012

## 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 'Hearing aid dispenser' 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 28 May 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. 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 12 July 2012. 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 23 August 2012.



## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Hearing aid dispenser profession came onto the register in April 2010 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 an HPC only visit. The education provider and validating body did not validate or review the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology), full time, BSc (Hons) Audiology, full time and Aptitude Test, flexible. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Tim Pringle (Hearing aid dispenser)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	35
First approved intake	January 2008
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Debbie Lockton (De Montfort University)
Secretary	Sophia Welton (De Montfort 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 (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 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 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.

## 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 of the programme documentation, and any advertising material, to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of HPC regulation.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that elements of the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of incorrect terminology within the programme documentation. The visitors noted within the 'Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology' (page 3) it states that it is a, "...programme of study that allows graduates to apply for recognition by the Health Profession Council." Upon successful completion of the programme all students become eligible to apply for registration with the HPC and practice as a hearing aid dispenser. The HPC does not provide recognition of the completion of education programmes and as such the language the education provider uses needs to reflect this. The visitors also noted that the programme documentation consistently makes reference to HPC regulating 'Hearing Aid Audiologists'. The protected title regulated by the HPC is 'hearing aid dispenser' which allows registrants to undertake the protected functions associated with the title. The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the protected title is consistently referred to throughout the documentation. The visitors considered that this use of incorrect terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to be amended to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to outline the systems used to ensure that all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

**Reason:** The visitors noted discussions with the programme team which outlined the procedure in place for approving practice placement educators who work in the NHS. The programme team stated that practice placement educators must be band six or above, have a minimum of two years' experience and have attended practice placement educator training. However, from these discussions the visitors were less clear about the procedures in place for approving practice placement educators who work in the independent sector. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to include clear formal protocols and an outline of the systems in place to ensure that practice placement educators from the independent sector have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience required to supervise a student from this 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 state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation.

## Recommendations

### **3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider developing additional mechanisms to ensure that the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme is able to access additional information and resources specific to hearing aid dispensing.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme is not on the HPC Register. However, the visitors were satisfied that they are appropriately qualified and experienced and that this standard is met. The visitors also noted that the programme maintained links to the profession specific issues associated with hearing aid dispensing through a number of mechanisms, which included inviting hearing aid dispensers to deliver teaching sessions and facilitating independent sector practice placements. Through discussions it was also apparent that the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme has close links with the British Academy of Audiology (BAA) and plans to develop links with the British Society of Hearing Aid Audiologists (BSHAA). The visitors recommend that the education provider continues to explore ways to support the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme in maintaining up to date profession specific knowledge specific to hearing aid dispensing.

### **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 reviewing the programme documentation to further highlight the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team and the students the visitors noted that the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are taught and assessed within the programme. The visitors were therefore satisfied that the curriculum makes sure that students understand the implications of these standards. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that references to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were limited. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to further highlight the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider developing a system for checking the HPC registration details of practice placement educators.

**Reason:** Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that they currently use a small range of approved practice placement educators and all are HPC registered. They were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors recommend that the education provider should consider developing a system for checking the HPC registration details of practice placement educators to accommodate any growth in practice placement educator numbers.

**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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to clearly state that any exit awards from the programme do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team, and a review of the programme documentation, the visitors were satisfied that any exit awards from the programme do not contain any reference to the HPC protected title or part of the Register. To provide further clarity the visitors recommend that the education provider should clearly state that any exit awards from the programme do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

Claire Brewis  
Linda Mutema  
Tim Pringle

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	De Montfort University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Hearing aid dispensers
<b>Date of visit</b>	3 – 4 April 2012

## 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 'Hearing aid dispenser' 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 28 May 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. 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 12 July 2012. 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 23 August 2012.

## Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their currently approved BSc (Hons) Audiology programme and reforming it into a new training route. Given the similarity between the approved programme and the new programme, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the September 2011 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme with the caveat that the education provider will have to meet all conditions in this report including any conditions the visitors set specifically for the first cohort of students who commenced the programme in September 2011.

This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was an HPC only visit. The education provider and validating body did not validate or review the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Audiology, full time, Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology, full time and Aptitude Test, flexible. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Tim Pringle (Hearing aid dispenser)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	35
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2011
Chair	Debbie Lockton (De Montfort University)
Secretary	Sophia Welton (De Montfort 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review any external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner for the programme as it is new.

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 (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 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 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 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.

## 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 of the programme documentation, and any advertising material, to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of HPC regulation.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that elements of the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of incorrect terminology within the documentation, stating that completion of the programme will enable graduates to register with the HPC. Upon successful completion of the programme all students become eligible to apply for registration with the HPC and as such the language the education provider uses needs to reflect this. The visitors also noted that the programme documentation consistently makes reference to HPC regulating 'Hearing Aid Audiologists'. The protected title regulated by the HPC is 'hearing aid dispenser' which allows registrants to undertake the protected functions associated with the title. The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the protected title is consistently referred to throughout the documentation. The visitors considered that the incorrect use of terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to be amended to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology.

### **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 to clearly highlight what becoming a hearing aid dispenser means, that the HPC is the statutory regulator for the profession and that successful completion of the programme provides to eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted limited reference to the title 'hearing aid dispenser' and the protected functions that are associated with it. The visitors also noted that there was limited reference to the fact that successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration as a hearing aid dispenser with the HPC. The visitors were concerned that the role of a hearing aid dispenser was not clearly highlighted within the programme documentation and that potential applicants, as well as students, would be unaware of the future employment options available to them. The visitors also noted limited reference to the role of the HPC as the statutory regulator for hearing aid dispensers. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation to include key information about the option of becoming a hearing aid dispenser. This information should ensure that applicants and students have all of the information

they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme and whether to apply to the HPC Register on successful completion of the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must re-visit all programme advertising materials to clearly highlight the potential distances students may be required to travel when attending placements including any associated additional costs.

**Reason:** In discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that students on the programme are fee paying. From discussions with students the visitors also noted that students may be expected to self-fund any additional costs associated with taking up a place on the programme, including costs associated with accommodation at placement, travel to and from placement and criminal record checks. From discussions with the programme team the visitors also noted that the geographical spread of placements is expanding with some placements over 100 miles from the education provider.

From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to determine where applicants and students would find out about the logistical arrangements associated with placements, including information about the potential distances students may be required to travel when attending placements and any additional costs associated with attending placement. This lack of information about likely placement locations and subsequent costs may mean that students cannot make an informed decision about whether to take up a place on the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation, including all advertising material, to clearly highlight to potential applicants the potential distances students may be required to travel when attending placements and any additional personal costs associated with attending placements.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to outline the systems used to ensure that all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

**Reason:** The visitors noted discussions with the programme team which outlined the procedure in place for approving practice placement educators who work in the NHS. The programme team stated that practice placement educators must be band six or above, have a minimum of two years' experience and have attended practice placement educator training. The visitors were satisfied with these criteria, however they were not provided with documentary evidence to support these discussions. The visitors also noted that the education provider utilises practice placement educators who work outside of the NHS. The visitors were less clear about the procedures in place for approving practice placement educators who work in the independent sector. The visitors therefore require the

education provider to provide further evidence to include clear formal protocols and an outline of the systems in place to ensure that practice placement educators from within the NHS and independent sector have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience required to supervise a student from this 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 state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation.

## Recommendations

### **3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider developing additional mechanisms to ensure that the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme is able to access additional information and resources specific to hearing aid dispensing.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme is not on the HPC Register. However, the visitors were satisfied that they are appropriately qualified and experienced and that this standard is met. The visitors also noted that the programme maintained links to the profession specific issues associated with hearing aid dispensing through a number of mechanisms, which included inviting hearing aid dispensers to deliver teaching sessions and facilitating independent sector practice placements. Through discussions it was also apparent that the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme has close links with the British Academy of Audiology (BAA) and plans to develop links with the British Society of Hearing Aid Audiologists (BSHAA). The visitors recommend that the education provider continues to explore ways to support the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme in maintaining up to date profession specific knowledge specific to hearing aid dispensing.

### **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 reviewing the programme documentation to further highlight the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team and the students the visitors noted that the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are taught and assessed within the programme. The visitors were therefore satisfied that the curriculum makes sure that students understand the implications of these standards. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that references to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were limited. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to further highlight the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider ways of supporting the programme team in the development of opportunities for independent sector practice placements.



**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation, and from discussions with the programme team, the visitors are satisfied that the number, duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. The visitors also noted in the discussions with the programme team and students' examples were given of students gaining experience in the independent sector. The visitors recommend that the education provider finds ways to support and encourage the programme team to continue facilitating independent sector placements for students. In this way the programme team may be able to consider enhancing this practice to ensure that all students can gain access to a wider range of placement learning experiences.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider developing a system for checking the HPC registration details of practice placement educators.

**Reason:** Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted plans to expand the range of practice placements to include non-NHS placements. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider developing a system for checking the HPC registration details of practice placement educators in non-NHS practice placements.

**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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to clearly state that any exit awards from the programme do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team, and a review of the programme documentation, the visitors were satisfied that any exit awards from the programme do not contain any reference to the HPC protected title or part of the Register. To provide further clarity the visitors recommend that the education provider should clearly state that any exit awards from the programme do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

Claire Brewis  
Linda Mutema  
Tim Pringle

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	De Montfort University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Hearing aid dispensers
<b>Date of visit</b>	3 – 4 April 2012

## 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 'Hearing aid dispenser' 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 28 May 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. 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 12 July 2012. 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 23 August 2012.

## Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their currently approved BSc (Hons) Audiology programme and reforming it into a new training route. Given the similarity between the approved programme and the new programme, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the September 2011 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme with the caveat that the education provider will have to meet all conditions in this report including any conditions the visitors set specifically for the first cohort of students who commenced the programme in September 2011.

This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was an HPC only visit. The education provider and validating body did not validate or review the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Audiology, full time, Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology, full time and Aptitude Test, flexible. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Tim Pringle (Hearing aid dispenser)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	35
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2011
Chair	Debbie Lockton (De Montfort University)
Secretary	Sophia Welton (De Montfort 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review any external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner for the programme as it is new.

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 (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 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 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 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.

## 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 of the programme documentation, and any advertising material, to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of HPC regulation.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that elements of the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of incorrect terminology within the documentation, stating that completion of the programme will enable graduates to register with the HPC. Upon successful completion of the programme all students become eligible to apply for registration with the HPC and as such the language the education provider uses needs to reflect this. The visitors also noted that the programme documentation consistently makes reference to HPC regulating 'Hearing Aid Audiologists'. The protected title regulated by the HPC is 'hearing aid dispenser' which allows registrants to undertake the protected functions associated with the title. The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the protected title is consistently referred to throughout the documentation. The visitors considered that the incorrect use of terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to be amended to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology.

### **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 to clearly highlight what becoming a hearing aid dispenser means, that the HPC is the statutory regulator for the profession and that successful completion of the programme provides to eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted limited reference to the title 'hearing aid dispenser' and the protected functions that are associated with it. The visitors also noted that there was limited reference to the fact that successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration as a hearing aid dispenser with the HPC. The visitors were concerned that the role of a hearing aid dispenser was not clearly highlighted within the programme documentation and that potential applicants, as well as students, would be unaware of the future employment options available to them. The visitors also noted limited reference to the role of the HPC as the statutory regulator for hearing aid dispensers. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation to include key information about the option of becoming a hearing aid dispenser. This information should ensure that applicants and students have all of the information

they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme and whether to apply to the HPC Register on successful completion of the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must re-visit all programme advertising materials to clearly highlight the potential distances students may be required to travel when attending placements including any associated additional costs.

**Reason:** In discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that students on the programme are fee paying. From discussions with students the visitors also noted that students may be expected to self-fund any additional costs associated with taking up a place on the programme, including costs associated with accommodation at placement, travel to and from placement and criminal record checks. From discussions with the programme team the visitors also noted that the geographical spread of placements is expanding with some placements over 100 miles from the education provider.

From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to determine where applicants and students would find out about the logistical arrangements associated with placements, including information about the potential distances students may be required to travel when attending placements and any additional costs associated with attending placement. This lack of information about likely placement locations and subsequent costs may mean that students cannot make an informed decision about whether to take up a place on the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation, including all advertising material, to clearly highlight to potential applicants the potential distances students may be required to travel when attending placements and any additional personal costs associated with attending placements.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to outline the systems used to ensure that all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

**Reason:** The visitors noted discussions with the programme team which outlined the procedure in place for approving practice placement educators who work in the NHS. The programme team stated that practice placement educators must be band six or above, have a minimum of two years' experience and have attended practice placement educator training. The visitors were satisfied with these criteria, however they were not provided with documentary evidence to support these discussions. The visitors also noted that the education provider utilises practice placement educators who work outside of the NHS. The visitors were less clear about the procedures in place for approving practice placement educators who work in the independent sector. The visitors therefore require the



education provider to provide further evidence to include clear formal protocols and an outline of the systems in place to ensure that practice placement educators from within the NHS and independent sector have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience required to supervise a student from this 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 state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation.

## Recommendations

### **3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider developing additional mechanisms to ensure that the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme is able to access additional information and resources specific to hearing aid dispensing.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme is not on the HPC Register. However, the visitors were satisfied that they are appropriately qualified and experienced and that this standard is met. The visitors also noted that the programme maintained links to the profession specific issues associated with hearing aid dispensing through a number of mechanisms, which included inviting hearing aid dispensers to deliver teaching sessions and facilitating independent sector practice placements. Through discussions it was also apparent that the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme has close links with the British Academy of Audiology (BAA) and plans to develop links with the British Society of Hearing Aid Audiologists (BSHAA). The visitors recommend that the education provider continues to explore ways to support the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme in maintaining up to date profession specific knowledge specific to hearing aid dispensing.

### **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 reviewing the programme documentation to further highlight the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team and the students the visitors noted that the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are taught and assessed within the programme. The visitors were therefore satisfied that the curriculum makes sure that students understand the implications of these standards. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that references to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were limited. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to further highlight the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider ways of supporting the programme team in the development of opportunities for independent sector practice placements.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation, and from discussions with the programme team, the visitors are satisfied that the number, duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. The visitors also noted in the discussions with the programme team and students' examples were given of students gaining experience in the independent sector. The visitors recommend that the education provider finds ways to support and encourage the programme team to continue facilitating independent sector placements for students. In this way the programme team may be able to consider enhancing this practice to ensure that all students can gain access to a wider range of placement learning experiences.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider developing a system for checking the HPC registration details of practice placement educators.

**Reason:** Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted plans to expand the range of practice placements to include non-NHS placements. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider developing a system for checking the HPC registration details of practice placement educators in non-NHS practice placements.

**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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to clearly state that any exit awards from the programme do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team, and a review of the programme documentation, the visitors were satisfied that any exit awards from the programme do not contain any reference to the HPC protected title or part of the Register. To provide further clarity the visitors recommend that the education provider should clearly state that any exit awards from the programme do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

Claire Brewis  
Linda Mutema  
Tim Pringle

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Glasgow Caledonian University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc in Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Date of visit</b>	3 – 4 April 2012

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	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 'Operating department practitioner' 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 18 May 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. 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 15 May 2012. 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 12 June 2012.

## 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 validated 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	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Nick Clark (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	20
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2012
Chair	Tony Kilpatrick (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Secretary	Morven Gillies (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Members of the joint panel	Gill Maxwell (Internal Panel Member) Jacqueline Riley (Internal Panel Member) Helen Booth (College of Operating Department Practitioners)

## 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review any external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner for the programme as it is new.

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 DipHE Operating Department Practice 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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining SET.

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 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 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.



## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to the HPC.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included instances of incorrect terminology in relation to the HPC's standards of conduct performance and ethics. In particular, there were instances of incorrect terminology in referencing the 'HPC Code of Conduct' (e.g. Module M1B721426, module descriptor; Mentor placement handbook, Appendix 1 and Practice placement document, p34). The HPC does not have a 'code of conduct' which a registrant must follow. Instead registrants must act in accordance with the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors considered the terminology to be misleading to students and therefore required the programme documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect terminology throughout.

## Recommendations

### **3.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider appointing an HPC registered operating department practitioner to the programme team to further enhance the profession specific profile of the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation provided the visitors were satisfied that the current core team had sufficient numbers of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to effectively deliver the programme. They also noted in discussions at the visit, the work that had been done by the current team to raise the profile of the profession throughout Scotland and to develop this new training route to professional registration. They were therefore satisfied that this standard has been met. In further discussions with the senior team it was highlighted that to support the programme in the future an additional member of staff would be recruited to provide input and support to the current programme team. The visitors recommend that the education provider considers the appointment of an HPC registered operating department practitioner to this role. In this way the education provider may be able to further enhance the profession specific profile of the programme.

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

**Recommendation:** The programme team should consider increasing the pass mark for the drug calculation assessment.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were satisfied that the assessment methods complied with external-reference frameworks and were therefore satisfied that this standard has been met. However, in discussion with the programme team it was highlighted that the current drug calculation assessment had a pass mark of 80 per cent. The programme team stated that this was proportional given the stage at which the student undertakes the assessment within the programme and is in line with the education provider's assessment criteria for passing an assessment of this kind. The visitors articulated in further discussion that it was common for assessments of this kind to have a 100 per cent pass mark, to embed the skill of drug calculation in students' learning and to enhance the patient safety aspects associated with drug calculation. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team consider revising the 80 per cent pass mark for this assessment and increase it to 100 per cent. In this way the programme team may enhance students' knowledge of the patient safety aspects associated with this skill set and further embed this in their learning.

Penny Joyce  
Nick Clark

Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Queen Margaret University
<b>Programme name</b>	Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Health psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	22- 23 March 2012

Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
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 'Health 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 8 May 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. 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 July 2012. 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 13 September 2012.

## 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 education provider reviewed the programme. The education provider 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, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Mark Forshaw (Health psychologist) Gareth Roderique-Davies (Health psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	5
First approved intake	January 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Judith Lane (Queen Margaret University)
Secretary	Sheila Adamson (Queen Margaret University)
Members of the joint panel	Vassilki Karkou (Internal Panel Member) Ian Elliott (Internal Panel Member) Jessica Moyer (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"/>
Programme monitoring materials	<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 44 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 13 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be 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.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate the last graduation date for the programme and demonstrates commitment to the resourcing of the programme until the programme ceases.

**Reason:** Information provided prior to the visit indicated the last cohort intake for the programme was in September 2009. The programme is now closed to new intakes. As such students on the programme have all transferred to the part time route and are in the process of completing. The information submitted indicated July 2014 was to be the last graduation date for this programme. However, at the visit, further information was presented that indicated students on the programme were at different stages of completion and the last graduation date was projected to be in 2016. To determine the programme will continue to be resourced and delivered at its current level until the programme ceases, the visitors require evidence to demonstrate the last graduation date for the programme and shows the education provider's commitment to the provision of resourcing the programme. In this way the visitors can be sure the programme will continue to meet the standards of education and training throughout the remaining time period.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must submit further evidence to demonstrate there are formal mechanisms in place to deal with informal feedback from students.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit described the programme's monitoring and evaluation systems. Documentation indicated Student/Staff Consultative Committees (SSCC) were used to formally manage student feedback, to "provide a forum for constructive discussion between students and staff about issues affecting the programme" (Validation document, p21). The visitors were aware students on the programme had completed the taught elements and were all working on assessment assignments away from the education provider with no requirement for scheduled contact. At the visit it was highlighted there had been some difficulties in running SSCC meetings due to the difficulties with students being unavailable to attend meetings. The programme team indicated students could informally feedback at any point to their director of studies or the module leaders. Because the students are on different placements and do not have any required contact time with the education provider or with each other, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine how the students could feedback to the programme team on any issues they experienced with the programme and how this feedback was formally recorded and dealt with. This would also ensure there is an audit trail for all feedback. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating formal mechanisms for dealing with informal feedback from students.



### **3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence that demonstrates how they ensure there is an effective system of academic and pastoral support in place for students.

**Reason:** Documentation provided at the visit indicated students were allocated a director of studies and a second supervisor to provide academic and pastoral student support. The visitors were aware students on the programme had completed the taught elements of the programme and were all now working on assessment assignments away from the education provider setting. The visitors noted there was the expectation that students met with their director of studies a minimum of 6 times per year whilst the taught elements of the programme were being held. There was no minimum number of meetings required for the students once the taught elements of the programme were complete. Discussion with the students indicated it was the students who initiated meetings with their director of studies when they felt it was necessary. The students were satisfied with the level of independent learning within the programme. The visitors noted that these meetings were initiated by the students and as such issues may arise only after students were experiencing problems as they may not realise they needed assistance until then. The visitors suggest regular meetings with students initiated by the programme team may prevent problems arising in this way. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensure an effective system of student support is in place to ensure that students are receiving appropriate and timely academic and pastoral support.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide revised documentation that explains the education provider fitness to practise policy for students and the workplace mentors.

**Reason:** Documentation at the visit provided the education provider's fitness to practise policy. There was a website link in the programme handbook to the education providers' regulations which included all regulations and the fitness to practise policy. However, the workplace mentor's handbook did not include information about the fitness to practise policy. The visitors considered the process could be used in relation to any concerns about students' profession-related conduct and as such, students and workplace mentors should be made aware of the process in case they need to interact with it. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise programme documentation to include information about how the education provider's fitness to practise policy operates for the students and the workplace mentors.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must submit any revised learning outcomes for the programme, or confirmation the previously submitted learning outcomes are not subject to change, prior to final programme approval by HPC.

**Reason:** Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend learning outcomes as part of the post-visit process for the education provider. If any changes are to be made to learning outcomes, the visitors will need to review them to ensure changes will not affect how the learning outcomes ensure students can meet the SOPs upon completion of the programme. The visitors require the programme team to resubmit learning outcomes if any changes are made, or to confirm the previously submitted learning outcomes are not subject to change, to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must ensure a thorough and effective system for the initial approval of all placements is in place.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit described the processes in place for initially approving placements for the programme. It is the students' responsibility to find placements and to initially discuss their needs with the placement provider. The placement provider fills out a 'Workplace Checklist Form' which is based on health and safety. The student completes a placement form identifying the learning goals for themselves at that placement. The programme team receive both forms and then an 'Initial placement visit' is carried out "within a few weeks of the start of placement learning" (Workplace Mentor Handbook, p7). The nature of the programme means often more than one placement is needed to fulfil the learning outcomes of the programme; the student could therefore be experiencing multiple placement sites.

Discussions with the students indicated the initial approval process was not always carried out. In one example a student described how they had initiated several placements without notifying the programme team because after a few weeks it had become evident the placement was not suitable for their purpose of the student meeting their learning outcomes and so had left. The students also indicated the initial meetings held between the programme team and the placement provider did not always occur. There were examples of students who had undertaken several different placements but had only experienced the initial placement meeting on one or two of their placements.

From the evidence provided the visitors could not identify how the programme team ensured the placement settings were appropriate; provided the student with a suitable environment to support the achievement of their competencies; were safe; or had appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to act as their workplace mentor. The visitors could not identify how the programme team managed placement situations where a student has more than one placement through the duration of the programme and ensured the initial approval process always took place.

The education provider has overall responsibility for placement learning and ensuring that suitable systems are in place to support it. To ensure that this SET is met, the visitors would like to receive documentation which illustrates a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all work place settings.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must ensure a thorough and effective system for the ongoing monitoring of placements is in place.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit described the processes in place for the ongoing monitoring of placements for the programme. The programme team has an initial placement meeting to review the goals set at the beginning of the placement; provide support and information about this programme to the workplace mentor; and ensure that students are able to access relevant learning opportunities within the placement. Discussion at the visit indicated this meeting also ensures the placement is a safe environment for the student to work in. Going forward, the programme team is available for further visits, telephone calls or emails when the placement provider or student requests this. The visitors are aware for a programme of this nature the duration of any placement is dependent on how much time the student needs to complete the learning objectives set for that placement. The visitors were concerned a student could be on a placement for an undetermined length of time and the programme team have no formal mechanisms for monitoring the placement to ensure it maintains its suitability for working with students. The visitors suggest a structured approach for the education provider to contact the placement provider regularly whilst the student is at the placement could be considered here. The visitors require evidence to demonstrate effective mechanisms for the ongoing monitoring of placements are in place.

#### **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 programme team must provide evidence of how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and monitored within practice placements.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit described the processes in place for initially approving placements for the programme. It is the students' responsibility to find placements and to initially discuss their needs with the placement provider. The placement provider fills out a 'Workplace Checklist Form' (Appendix 1 Workplace Mentor Handbook). The workplace checklist form is based on health and safety, risk assessments and accidents and incident policies. The programme team receive this form and an 'Initial placement visit' is carried out "within a few weeks of the start of placement learning" (Workplace Mentor Handbook, p7). Discussion indicated the workplace checklist form is corroborated at this visit and the placement setting is discussed. From the evidence provided the visitors were unable to determine how the programme team ensures practice placements have equality and diversity policies in place

and that they are implemented and monitored. This could be documented as part of the placement approval and monitoring processes. The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates the programme team ensures equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and monitored within practice placements.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence of how they ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit described the processes in place for initially approving placements for the programme. It is the students' responsibility to find placements and to initially discuss their needs with the placement provider. The placement provider fills out a 'Workplace Checklist Form' (Appendix 1 Workplace Mentor Handbook). The workplace checklist form is based on health and safety, risk assessments and accidents and incident policies. The programme team receive this form and an 'Initial placement visit' is carried out "within a few weeks of the start of placement learning" (Workplace Mentor Handbook, p7). Discussion indicated the workplace checklist form is corroborated at this visit and the placement setting is discussed. From the evidence provided the visitors were unable to determine how the programme team ensures there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting. This could be documented as part of the placement approval and monitoring processes. The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how the programme team ensures there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence of how they ensure the workplace mentors have relevant knowledge, skills and experience needed to work with students from this programme.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit described the processes in place for initially approving placements for the programme. It is the students' responsibility to find placements and to initially discuss their needs with the placement provider. The placement provider fills out a 'Workplace Checklist Form' (Appendix 1 Workplace Mentor Handbook). The workplace checklist form is based on health and safety, risk assessments and accidents and incident policies. The programme team receive this form and an 'Initial placement visit' is carried out "within a few weeks of the start of placement learning" (Workplace Mentor Handbook, p7). Discussion indicated the workplace checklist form is corroborated at this visit and the placement setting is discussed. From the evidence provided the visitors were unable to determine how the programme team ensures workplace mentors at the placement have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience needed to work directly with the students. This could be documented as part of the placement approval and monitoring processes. The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how the programme team

ensures the workplace mentors have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience needed to work with students from this programme.

**5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- the learning outcomes to be achieved;
- the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;
- expectations of professional conduct;
- the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and
- communication and lines of responsibility.

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how they maintain a placement provider's understanding of the student's placement.

**Reason:** Discussions at the visit indicated it was the student who primarily acted to liaise between the programme team and placement provider. The visitors noted the placement providers could contact the programme team at any point for support, however students and the placement providers indicated they expected that this would be done through the student. The visitors were satisfied the initial approval meetings would be used to prepare the placement provider for the placement. However, they considered the nature of this programme meant a placement could continue for an undetermined amount of time and therefore aspects of the placement could change. The visitors considered the programme team is required to ensure the placement providers continually understand and are prepared for; the learning goals being, or not being, achieved; the timings and duration of the placement; the assessment procedures and implications of failure to progress; and communication and lines of responsibility. The visitors suggest a structured approach for the programme team to contact the placement provider regularly whilst the student is at the placement could be considered here. The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates how the programme team maintains placement providers' understanding of the students' placement.

**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 programme team must submit any revised learning outcomes for the programme, or confirmation the previously submitted learning outcomes are not subject to change, prior to final programme approval by HPC.

**Reason:** Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend learning outcomes as part of the post-visit process for the education provider. If any changes are to be made to learning outcomes the visitors will need to review them to ensure changes will not affect the learning outcomes or the assessment of the learning outcomes. The visitors require the programme team to resubmit the programme learning outcomes if any changes are made, or to confirm the previously submitted learning outcomes are not subject to change. In this way the

visitors can be sure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must clearly articulate within the programme documentation that no aegrotat award can be conferred on students from this programme.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted there was insufficient detail regarding aegrotat awards. Discussion at the visit indicated the education provider does not confer aegrotat awards. The visitors were satisfied with this arrangement. However, to demonstrate this standard is met, the visitors require the programme team to include a statement explaining that no aegrotat awards can be conferred on students from this programme, in the programme documentation.

**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 programme team must clearly articulate in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the register or that other arrangements will be agreed.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted there was insufficient detail regarding external examiner policies for the programme. The visitors were satisfied with the arrangements currently in place for the programme. However, to demonstrate this standard is met, the visitors require documentary evidence to show recognition of HPC requirements for the external examiners.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors suggest the education provider have one nominated person to oversee the placement organisation for all students on the programme.

**Reason:** Discussion at the visit indicated each student had a member of the programme team allocated as their 'director of studies' and one allocated as their 'second supervisor' who were available for them whilst they were on placement. The visitors heard that occasionally there were instances when the people in these roles needed to change suddenly. This had led to students being out on placement with no designated contact on the programme team. The visitors felt if someone was nominated to have oversight of where all the students were on their placements and when they had last been visited or contacted, it would be easier for the programme team to manage any changes in staff roles. The visitors also felt this arrangement would help with the concerns identified in conditions under 3.12, 5.4 and 5.11 in this report.

Mark Forshaw  
Gareth Roderique-Davies

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Queen Margaret University
<b>Programme name</b>	Diploma in Higher Education Hearing Aid Audiology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Hearing aid dispensers
<b>Date of visit</b>	11 – 12 April 2012

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	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 'Hearing aid dispenser' 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 18 May 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. 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 18 May 2012. 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 12 June 2012.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Hearing aid dispenser profession came onto the register in 1 April 2010 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 an HPC only visit. The education provider and validating body did not review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Victoria Adenugba
Proposed student numbers	15
First approved intake	September 2009
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Roni Bamber (Queen Margaret University)
Secretary	Marcus Walker (Queen Margaret 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 (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 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can 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.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit all of the programme documentation, and any advertising material, to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of HPC regulation.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that elements of the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of incorrect or out-of-date terminology with reference to HPC accrediting the programme (Rational for proposed changes, School Academic Board 2011). The HPC does not accredit education programmes we approve education programmes. Within the 'Supervisors handbook' (page 7), the visitors also noted the statement, "... this course also gives graduates a clinical qualification leading to a licence to practice." Upon successful completion of the programme all students become eligible to apply for registration with the HPC and as such the language the education provider uses needs to reflect this. The visitors also noted that the programme documentation and website consistently make reference to HPC regulating 'Hearing Aid Audiologists'. The protected title regulated by the HPC is 'Hearing aid dispenser' which allows registrants to undertake the protected functions associated with the title. The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation and website to ensure that the protected title is consistently referred to throughout. The visitors considered that the incorrect use of terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to be amended to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of formal mechanisms in place which ensure that student concerns whilst on placement are managed to ensure all placements remain safe and supportive.

**Reason:** During discussions with the programme team and students the visitors learnt that any issues or concerns that arose whilst students were on campus were dealt with formally and procedures are in place to record issues or concerns. The visitors reviewed these policies and were satisfied that enough support was provided to students whilst they were on campus. However, the visitors also learnt that concerns or issues that arose whilst students were at placement were dealt with informally by the programme leader and no formal record of the concerns or issues were kept. The visitors noted that the current cohort is small and this allowed the programme leader to keep on top of any issues of concerns raised by the students at placements. However as the programme cohort is expected to increase the visitors considered this method of informal monitoring to not be rigorous enough to ensure that all placements remain safe and supportive. The visitors require the programme team to ensure that formal mechanisms are in place which ensures that student concerns whilst on placement are managed to ensure all placements remain safe and supportive.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to ensure module learning hours correlate with the module credits.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that the learning hours associated with modules S1160 'Psycho-social aspects of deafness', S1172 'Basic Anatomy, Physiology and Pathology of the Audio-Vestibular System' and S2152 'Counselling Skills 2' did not correlate with the education provider's policy on awarding credit. The visitors recommend that the education provider should review these modules to ensure the module learning hours correlate with the credits awarded.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider amending the student consent protocols to clearly articulate that consent to participate as a service user in practical and clinical teaching can be withdrawn.

**Reason:** The visitors noted discussions with the programme team and students where it was stated that consent to participate as a service user in practical and clinical teaching could be withdrawn at any point in the programme. However, from a review of the current consent protocols the visitors felt that this was not clearly communicated. . The visitors recommend that the education provider consider amending their current consent protocols, including the consent form to clearly articulate that consent to participate as a service user in practical and clinical teaching can be withdrawn.

### **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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider amending the student handbook to clearly articulate the attendance requirements for the programme.

**Reason:** Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that students must attend 100 percent of the programme and all elements are therefore mandatory. The visitors also noted that the attendance requirement was stated within each module descriptor and were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors did not feel that the attendance policy was clearly articulated. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider amending the current student handbook to clearly articulate the attendance requirements as they currently do within the supervisor handbook.



## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Staffordshire University
<b>Programme name</b>	DipHE Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Date of visit</b>	1 – 2 May 2012

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	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 'Operating department practitioner' 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 1 June 2012 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 5 July 2012. 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 27 July 2012. 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 23 August 2012.

## 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 - the level of qualification for entry to the Register, programme admissions, 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 and validating body validated the programme. The education provider 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 outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Victoria Adenugba
Proposed student numbers	22
First approved intake	1 September 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 March 2013
Chair	Mike Goodwin (Staffordshire University)
Secretary	Nick Revell (Staffordshire University)
Members of the joint panel	Michelle Hammond (Internal Panel Member) Dawn Holding (Internal Panel Member) Kevin Reiling (Internal Panel Member) Deborah Robinson (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"/>

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

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can 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.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The programme team must resubmit all finalised module handbooks once they have been approved by the education provider.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors reviewed the module descriptors and 3 module handbooks which outlined in detail what each module contained. The visitors were only provided with 3 module handbooks out of the 7 modules. During discussion with the programme team the visitors learnt that the module handbooks were still being finalised and produced for the remaining 4 modules. In order to be confident that the final modules will ensure that students who complete this programme are able to meet all the standards of proficiency the visitors require the finalised module handbooks to be resubmitted for review.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must ensure programme documentation clearly articulates the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation provided the visitors learnt that students would be able to progress on to the second year with 90 credits out of the 120 credits needed to remain in the second year. The visitors could not ascertain when students would need to make up their last 30 credits to remain in the second year. During discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that the education providers' progression policy stipulated that the remaining 30 credits would need to be accomplished within 12 weeks in to the second year, if this was not met the student would not be able to remain in the second year. As this standard requires that the requirements for progression are made clear to students, the visitors require the programme team to revise their programme documentation.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The programme team should continue to improve the skills laboratory to reflect the needs of operating department practitioner (ODP) students.

**Reason:** During a tour of the facilities the visitors saw the skills laboratory used by students. They noticed that the set-up of the lab was more reflective of a ward than a theatre and some ODP apparatus, such as a theatre table, was not available within the skills laboratory. During discussions the visitors learnt that students were taught specialised practical skills whilst out on placement and the labs were used for general skills development. As a result the visitors were happy that this standard was being met. The visitors also learnt that the programme team had put in a proposal for funding to improve the skills lab and. The visitors wanted to express their support for this aim to improve the skills labs and to encourage the programme team to look at acquiring more ODP specific equipment so that the skills labs can also reflect a typical ODP environment and the needs of ODP students.

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

**Recommendation:** The programme team should consider standardising their mentor database across all placements.

**Reason:** During the visit the visitors requested and were presented with the mentor databases for all the placement sites currently used by the programme. The visitors reviewed the mentor databases but found them hard to follow as they were recorded using different formats and provided different levels of information. During discussions the visitors learnt that each placement site has the responsibility to maintain their mentor database which the education provider requests and cross checks to ensure students are not sent out with mentors who have not been trained or retrained within the last 2 years. The visitors learnt that the programme team undertakes the training and retraining of their mentors on site at placements to ensure all mentors can attend and are updated. As a result the visitors were happy that this standard was being met. The visitors suggest that the programme team standardises the mentor database forms used by placement sites to make sure that the information provided by each placement site is consistent and easy to follow by any member of staff or lay person.

Tony Scripps  
Andrew Steel

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Exeter
<b>Programme name</b>	Educational, Child and Community Psychology (D.Ed.Psy)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Educational psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	3 – 4 May 2012

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	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 '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 21 June 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. 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 12 June 2012. 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 5 July 2012.



## 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	Judith Bamford (Educational psychologist) Peter Branston (Educational psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	David Christopher
Proposed student numbers	5
First approved intake	January 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Rupert Wegerif (University of Exeter)
Secretary	Jenny Andrews (University of Exeter)
Members of the joint panel	Sandra Dunsmuir (British Psychological Society) Julia Hardy (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society) Rupal Nathwani (British Psychological Society) Merkel Sender (British Psychological Society) Dilanthi Weerasinghe (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"/>
Student written feedback on the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Details of practice placement educators and attendance at training events	<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 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can 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.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that the programme does not offer an aegrotat award.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the SETs mapping document provided prior to the visit stated that the programme does not offer an aegrotat award. However, the programme documentation did not make any reference to this fact. The visitors noted that this was potentially confusing to applicants and students and could lead to the mistaken belief that an aegrotat award was available and provided eligibility for admission to the Register. The visitors therefore require the education provider to include a clear statement in the programme documentation that the programme does not offer an aegrotat award 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 revise the programme documentation to include a clear statement that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the appointment of external examiners for the programme. The education provider had provided external examiner reports and evidence that the current external examiner was registered with the HPC. The visitors were satisfied that there was a system of external examiners in place and were content with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that the HPC requirements regarding the external examiner for the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider revising the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to make clear to potential applicants that the programme does not accredit prior (experiential) learning.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the SETs mapping document submitted prior to the visit stated that the programme does not have a scheme for accrediting prior (experiential) learning. However, the programme documentation and advertising materials did not make this clear. The visitors noted that it would be helpful to potential applicants if the absence of such a scheme was made clear. The visitors suggest that the education provider give consideration to revising the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to make clear to potential applicants that the programme does not accredit prior (experiential) learning.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should continue to develop the procedures for monitoring attendance at practice placement educator training.

**Reason:** The visitors were content that this standard continues to be met. They noted the training that was made available to practice placement educators and the close links that the education provider had forged with practice placement educators. The visitors also noted that the training events provided were not always well attended. However, the visitors welcomed the steps that have been taken to monitor attendance at training events and suggested that the education provider continue to develop its monitoring processes in order to facilitate the training of practice placement educators.

Judith Bamford  
Peter Branston

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Lancaster
<b>Programme name</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	9 – 10 May 2012

## 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 '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 8 June 2012 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 5 July 2012. 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 1 August 2012. 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 13 September 2012.

## 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 as 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	Peter Branston (Educational psychologist) Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	24
First approved intake	January 2000
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Fiona Benson (University of Lancaster)
Secretary	Katherine Thackeray (University of Lancaster)
Members of the joint panel	Isabel Hargreaves (British Psychological Society) Jacqui Stedmon (British Psychological Society) Frances Blumenfeld (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

The HPC did not review description of modules prior to the visit as the programme is not based around a modular structure.

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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 1 SET.

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.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the systems in place that ensure that practice placement educators undertake regular refresher training.

**Reason:** From discussions with the practice placement providers and the programme team the visitors noted a number of practice placement educators had undertaken the initial supervisor training programme several years ago and had not undertaken any refresher training. Discussions with the programme team highlighted plans to engage with practice placement educators who had not undertaken supervisor training for several years. The visitors noted the programme team had developed a questionnaire to seek the views of practice placement educators on this issue and as a result are now planning to develop a rolling programme of advanced supervisor training. The visitors require further evidence of these plans and any systems in place that ensure all practice placement educators undertake regular refresher training.

Peter Branston  
Ruth Baker

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Manchester
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Hearing aid dispensers
<b>Date of visit</b>	21 – 22 March 2012

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	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 'Hearing aid dispenser' 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 17 May 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. 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 29 June 2012. 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 23 August 2012.

## 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 an HPC only visit. The education provider and validating body did not validate or review the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Audiology, full time and MSc Audiology (with clinical competency certificate – CCC) (formerly known as MSc Audiology (with clinical competency certificate or certificate of audiological competence), full time. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser) Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	20
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2012
Chair	Anne Hesketh (University of Manchester)
Secretary	Ryan Hurst (University of Manchester)

## 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review any external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner for the programme as it is new.

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 BSc (Hons) Audiology and MSc Audiology (with clinical competency certificate – CCC) 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 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 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 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.



## 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 of the programme documentation, and any advertising material, to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of HPC regulation.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that elements of the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of incorrect or out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC 'accrediting' the programme. The HPC does not accredit education programmes we approve education programmes. The visitors also noted reference to 'state registration' throughout the documentation. The term 'state registered' is no longer used by the professions we regulate and should not be incorporated into any materials relating to an HPC approved programme. The documentation also, on occasion, stated that completion of the programme will enable graduates to register with the HPC. Upon successful completion of the programme all students become eligible to apply for registration with the HPC and as such the language the education provider uses needs to reflect this.

The visitors finally noted that the programme award title is BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology); however the education provider frequently referred to the programme as 'BSc Healthcare Science (Audiology)'. The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the award title is consistently referred to throughout the documentation. The visitors considered that the current terminology in place could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to be amended to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology to ensure consistency.

### **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 to clearly highlight that successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration as a hearing aid dispenser with the HPC. The education provider must also revisit the programme documentation to ensure that applicants and students are given further information about the option of becoming a hearing aid dispenser and what it entails. The education provider must finally clearly highlight the role of the HPC as the statutory regulator for hearing aid dispensers.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted limited reference to hearing aid dispensers and the fact that successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration as a

hearing aid dispenser with the HPC. The visitors were concerned that the role of a hearing aid dispenser was not clearly highlighted within the programme documentation and that potential applicants as well as students on the programme would be unaware of the options available to them. The visitors also noted little reference to the role of the HPC as the statutory regulator for hearing aid dispensers. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation in relation to information regarding the option of becoming a hearing aid dispenser to ensure that applicants have the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants are made aware of the funding arrangements for the programme and any likely additional costs associated with taking up a place on the programme.

**Reason:** In discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that all pre-Registration Hearing aid dispenser programmes delivered by the education provider will now be funded by fee paying students. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to locate information relating to the funding of the programme. From discussions with students the visitors also noted that students may be expected to self-fund additional costs associated with taking up a place on the programme. Some students noted that they were required to stay in hospital accommodation when going on placement and that they self-funded the associated costs. Some students also stated that costs associated with accommodation and travel could be claimed back. The visitors were unable to locate information relating to additional costs or funding support within the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to ensure that the funding arrangements for the programme and any potential additional costs and funding support associated with the programme are clearly stated to demonstrate that this standard has been met.

**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 to clearly highlight the range and length of practice placements in year one of the programme and further highlight that Audiology is the only neurosensory theme delivered by the education provider and the programme team will support students who wish to transfer to another theme on a case by case basis. .

**Reason:** In discussions with the programme team it was stated students will be required to undertake ten weeks of practice placement in year one of the programme (six weeks observing audiology settings and four weeks observing neurophysiology, ophthalmic and vision science settings). However from a review

of the programme documentation the visitors noted it states students are required to undertake six weeks of practice placement in year one of the programme and considered the information to be potentially misleading. The visitors also noted discussions with the programme team where it was stated that the education provider is in discussion with local higher education providers concerning potential partnerships that would allow students to transfer between Practitioner Training Programme (PTP), but at present any request would be considered on a case by case basis. The visitors considered this to be important information that an applicant would require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation, including advertising materials to further highlight that the University of Manchester only offers the Audiology neurosensory theme and that any request to transfer to another PTP themes will be supported and considered by the programme team on a case by case basis. The education provider must also clearly highlight the range and length of practice placements in year one 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 ensure that a formal system is in place for gaining students informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching.

**Reason:** Through discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that consent was obtained verbally from students when participating as service users in practical teaching. The visitors also noted that the education provider has plans to develop formal protocols to support the consent process. The visitors were not presented with clear protocols to demonstrate that a formal system is in place for gaining students informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching. The visitors therefore require the education provider to implement formal protocols for obtaining consent from students (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme) and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching (such as alternative learning arrangements).

### **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 from the programme do not provide eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors noted information relating to the programme exit awards that could be misleading to applicants and students. The visitors noted that within the programme documentation the education provider makes reference to “professional regulation” when discussing exit awards and does not

differentiate between the awards that lead to eligibility to Register as an audiologist and the award that leads to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register as a hearing aid dispenser. In the 'BSc Healthcare Science (Audiology) programme handbook' (page 10) it states "to obtain the clinical qualification in Healthcare Science (Audiology), and be eligible for registration, you must achieve the minimum number of academic and clinical credits as specified below" and goes on to list the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology) and BSc (Ord) Healthcare Science (Audiology). The visitors noted that statements relating to the award of an ordinary degree leading to professional registration to be potentially misleading and could lead to the assumption that these awards may allow students to apply to the HPC Register when they do not. Therefore, visitors need to see evidence that the documentation clearly articulates that any exit awards from this programme would not confer eligibility to apply to the HPC Register, to ensure that this standard can be met.

## Recommendations

### **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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to further highlight learning outcomes specific to the hearing aid dispenser part of the Register.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the delivery of hearing aid specific content ensures that those who successfully complete the programme can meet the relevant standards of proficiency. The visitors noted that the 'Professional Studies' modules incorporate professional issues and topics associated with hearing aid dispensing. The visitors also noted that students receive lectures from hearing aid dispensers and that some students get the opportunity to undertake practice placements in non-NHS settings. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors highlighted that it was not always clear which learning outcomes are associated with which standard of proficiency. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to further emphasise the learning outcomes that are specific to hearing aid dispensing.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider further developing opportunities for interprofessional learning within the programme.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors noted examples of interprofessional learning within the programme with sessions being shared with speech and language therapy students. The visitors were satisfied that the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group was adequately addressed and therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors also noted that the education provider runs a range of health and social care programmes and recommend that the education provider should continue to develop further opportunities for interprofessional learning within the programme.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing its practice placement audit processes to ensure they are applicable to and include non-NHS placements.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied with the current system for approving and monitoring practice placements. The visitors noted that the education provider has a robust audit process in place for NHS placements.

Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted future plans to expand the range of practice placements to include non-NHS placements. The visitors also noted the current arrangements in place where students can go to non-NHS settings for a period of ad hoc placement days to gain a greater insight into hearing aid dispensing and private practice. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider reviewing its practice placement audit processes to ensure they are applicable to and include non-NHS placements. The visitors suggest that this may be an adapted approval and monitoring mechanism for short ad hoc placements but highlight the importance of having some quality safeguards in place at all times.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the mechanisms in place to monitor the attendance of practice placement educators at practice placement educator training and introduce a requirement for refresher training.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with practice placement educators the visitors noted that the education provider facilitates an annual 'Clinical Educator Training Day'. The visitors noted that all new practice placement educators must attend this training before they can supervise a student and that they are expected to attend subsequent practice placement educator training events. However, the visitors noted that refresher training is not mandatory and the education provider does not outline a minimum requirement for attendance at subsequent practice placement educator training events. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider should consider reviewing the mechanisms in place to monitor the attendance of practice placement educators at practice placement educator training and introduce a requirement for refresher training to ensure that all practice placement educators remain engaged with the programme and up to date.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider developing a system for checking the HPC registration details of practice placement educators in non-NHS practice placements.

**Reason:** Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted future plans to expand the range of practice placements to include non-NHS placements. The visitors also noted the current arrangements in place where students can go to non-NHS settings for a period of ad hoc placement days to gain a greater insight into hearing aid dispensing and private practise. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider developing a system for checking the HPC registration details of practice placement educators in non-NHS practice placements to ensure that this standard continues to be met if the programme increases its use of non-NHS placements.

Richard Sykes  
Hugh Crawford

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Manchester
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Audiology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Hearing aid dispensers
<b>Date of visit</b>	21 – 22 March 2012

## 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 'Hearing aid dispenser' 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 17 May 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. 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 29 June 2012. 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 23 August 2012.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Hearing aid dispenser profession came onto the register in April 2010 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 an HPC only visit. The education provider and validating body did not validate or review the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology), full time and MSc Audiology (with clinical competency certificate – CCC) (formerly known as MSc Audiology (with clinical competency certificate or certificate of audiological competence), full time. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser) Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	30
First approved intake	September 2002
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Anne Hesketh (University of Manchester)
Secretary	Ryan Hurst (University of Manchester)

## 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 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.

## 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 of the programme documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of HPC regulation.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that elements of the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of incorrect or out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC 'accrediting' the programme. The HPC does not accredit education programmes we approve education programmes. The visitors also noted reference to 'state registration' throughout the documentation. The term 'state registered' is no longer used by the professions we regulate and should not be incorporated into any materials relating to an HPC approved programme. The documentation also, on occasion, stated that completion of the programme will enable graduates to register with the HPC. Upon successful completion of the programme all students become eligible to apply for registration with the HPC and as such the language the education provider uses needs to reflect this.

The visitors finally noted that the current HPC approved programme title is BSc (Hons) Audiology; however the education provider frequently referred to the programme as 'BSc Audiology'. The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the award title is consistently referred to throughout the documentation. The visitors considered that the current terminology in place could be misleading to students and therefore require all programme documentation to be amended to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology to ensure consistency.

### **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 to clearly highlight that successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration as a hearing aid dispenser with the HPC. The education provider must also revisit the programme documentation to ensure that students are given further information about the option of becoming a hearing aid dispenser and what it entails. The education provider must finally clearly highlight the role of the HPC as the statutory regulator for hearing aid dispensers.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted limited reference to hearing aid dispensers and the fact that successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration as a hearing aid dispenser with the HPC. The visitors were concerned that the role of a hearing aid dispenser was not clearly highlighted within the programme

documentation and that students on the programme would be unaware of the options available to them. The visitors also noted little reference to the role of the HPC as the statutory regulator for hearing aid dispensers. The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to clearly highlight that successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration as a hearing aid dispenser with the HPC, to ensure that students are given further information about the option of becoming a hearing aid dispenser and clearly highlight the role of the HPC as the statutory regulator for hearing aid dispensers.

## **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 to ensure that students are made aware of any likely additional costs on the programme.

**Reason:** From discussions with students the visitors noted that students may be expected to self-fund additional costs associated with taking up a place on the programme. Some students noted that they were required to stay in hospital accommodation when going on placement and that they self-funded the associated costs. Some students also stated that costs associated with accommodation and travel could be claimed back. The visitors were unable to locate information relating to additional costs or funding support within the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to ensure that the funding arrangements for the programme and any potential additional costs and funding support associated with the programme are clearly stated to demonstrate that this standard has been 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 ensure that a formal system is in place for gaining students informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching.

**Reason:** Through discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that consent was obtained verbally from students when participating as service users in practical teaching. The visitors also noted that the education provider has plans to develop formal protocols to support the consent process. The visitors were not presented with clear protocols to demonstrate that a formal system is in place for gaining students informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching. The visitors therefore require the education provider to implement formal protocols for obtaining consent from students (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme) and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching (such as alternative learning arrangements).

**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 from the programme do not provide eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors noted information relating to the programme exit awards that could be misleading to applicants and students. The visitors noted that within the programme documentation the education provider makes reference to “professional regulation” when discussing exit awards and does not differentiate between the awards that lead to eligibility to Register as an audiologist and the award that leads to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register as a hearing aid dispenser. In the ‘BSc (Hons) Audiology Programme Handbook’ (page 10) it states that “you will be required to pass all specified academic and clinical elements of the degree (after compensation and resit arrangements have applied) in order to achieve eligibility for professional registration”. However, on page 12 of the same document it suggests that the award of BSc Audiology leads to professional registration. The visitors noted that statements relating to the award of an ordinary degree leading to professional registration to be potentially misleading and could lead to the assumption that these awards may allow students to apply to the HPC Register when they do not. Therefore, visitors need to see evidence that the documentation clearly articulates that any exit awards from this programme would not confer eligibility to apply to the HPC Register, to ensure that this standard can be met.

## Recommendations

### **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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to further highlight learning outcomes specific to the hearing aid dispenser part of the Register.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the delivery of hearing aid specific content ensures that those who successfully complete the programme can meet the relevant standards of proficiency. The visitors noted that the 'Professional Studies' modules incorporate professional issues and topics associated with hearing aid dispensing. The visitors also noted that students receive lectures from hearing aid dispensers and that some students get the opportunity to undertake practice placements in non-NHS settings. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors highlighted that it was not always clear which learning outcomes are associated with which standard of proficiency. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to further emphasise the learning outcomes that are specific to hearing aid dispensing.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider further developing opportunities for interprofessional learning within the programme.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors noted examples of interprofessional learning within the programme with sessions being shared with speech and language therapy students. The visitors were satisfied that the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group was adequately addressed and therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors also noted that the education provider runs a range of health and social care programmes and recommend that the education provider should continue to develop further opportunities for interprofessional learning within the programme.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing its practice placement audit processes to ensure they are applicable to and include non-NHS placements.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied with the current system for approving and monitoring practice placements. The visitors noted that the education provider has a robust audit process in place for NHS placements.



Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted future plans to expand the range of practice placements to include non-NHS placements. The visitors also noted the current arrangements in place where students can go to non-NHS settings for a period of ad hoc placement days to gain a greater insight into hearing aid dispensing and private practise. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider reviewing its practice placement audit processes to ensure they are applicable to and include non-NHS placements. The visitors suggest that this may be an adapted approval and monitoring mechanism for short ad hoc placements but highlight the importance of having some quality safeguards in place at all times.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the mechanisms in place to monitor the attendance of practice placement educators at practice placement educator training and introduce a requirement for refresher training.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with practice placement educators the visitors noted that the education provider facilitates an annual 'Clinical Educator Training Day'. The visitors noted that all new practice placement educators must attend this training before they can supervise a student and that they are expected to attend subsequent practice placement educator training events. However, the visitors noted that refresher training is not mandatory and the education provider does not outline a minimum requirement for attendance at subsequent practice placement educator training events. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider should consider reviewing the mechanisms in place to monitor the attendance of practice placement educators at practice placement educator training and introduce a requirement for refresher training to ensure that all practice placement educators remain engaged with the programme and up to date.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider developing a system for checking the HPC registration details of practice placement educators in non-NHS practice placements.

**Reason:** Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted future plans to expand the range of practice placements to include non-NHS placements. The visitors also noted the current arrangements in place where students can go to non-NHS settings for a period of ad hoc placement days to gain a greater insight into hearing aid dispensing and private practise. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider developing a system for checking the HPC registration details of practice placement educators in non-NHS practice placements to ensure that this standard continues to be met if the programme increases its use of non-NHS placements.

Richard Sykes  
Hugh Crawford

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Manchester
<b>Programme name</b>	MSc Audiology (with clinical competency certificate – CCC) – formerly known as MSc Audiology (with clinical competency certificate or certificate of audiological competence)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Hearing aid dispensers
<b>Date of visit</b>	21 – 22 March 2012

## 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 'Hearing aid dispenser' 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 17 May 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. 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 29 June 2012. 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 23 August 2012.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Hearing aid dispenser profession came onto the register in April 2010 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 an HPC only visit. The education provider and validating body did not validate or review the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Audiology, full time and BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology), full time. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser) Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	11
First approved intake	June 2007
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Anne Hesketh (University of Manchester)
Secretary	Ryan Hurst (University of Manchester)

## 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 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.

## 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 of the programme documentation, and any advertising material, to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of HPC regulation.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that elements of the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of incorrect or out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC 'accrediting' the programme. The HPC does not accredit education programmes we approve education programmes. The visitors also noted reference to 'state registration' throughout the documentation. The term 'state registered' is no longer used by the professions we regulate and should not be incorporated into any materials relating to an HPC approved programme. The documentation also, on occasion, stated that completion of the programme will enable graduates to register with the HPC. Upon successful completion of the programme all students become eligible to apply for registration with the HPC and as such the language the education provider uses needs to reflect this.

The visitors finally noted reference within the 'MSc Audiology Handbook' (page 8) to the Certificate of Audiological Competence (CAC), administered by the British Academy of Audiology. The visitors noted that this award is no longer available. The visitors considered the current terminology in place could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to be amended to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology to ensure consistency.

### **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 to clearly highlight that successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration as a hearing aid dispenser with the HPC. The education provider must also revisit the programme documentation to ensure that applicants and students are given further information about the option of becoming a hearing aid dispenser and what it entails. The education provider must finally clearly highlight the role of the HPC as the statutory regulator for hearing aid dispensers.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted limited reference to hearing aid dispensers and the fact that successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration as a hearing aid dispenser with the HPC. The visitors were concerned that the role of a hearing aid dispenser was not clearly highlighted within the programme



documentation and that potential applicants as well as students on the programme would be unaware of the options available to them. The visitors also noted little reference to the role of the HPC as the statutory regulator for hearing aid dispensers. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation in relation to information regarding the option of becoming a hearing aid dispenser to ensure that applicants have the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants are made aware of the funding arrangements for the programme and any likely additional costs associated with taking up a place on the programme.

**Reason:** In discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that all pre-Registration hearing aid dispenser programmes delivered by the education provider will now be funded by fee paying students. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to locate information relating to the funding of the programme. From discussions with students the visitors also noted that students may be expected to self-fund additional costs associated with taking up a place on the programme. Some students noted that they were required to stay in hospital accommodation when going on placement and that they self-funded the associated costs. Some students also stated that costs associated with accommodation and travel could be claimed back. The visitors were unable to locate information relating to additional costs or funding support within the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to ensure that the funding arrangements for the programme and any potential additional costs and funding support associated with the programme are clearly stated to demonstrate that this standard has been 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 ensure that a system is in place for gaining students informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through discussion with the programme team, consent was obtained verbally from students when participating as service users in practical teaching. The visitors also noted that the education provider has plans to develop formal protocols to support the consent process. However, the visitors were not presented with formal protocols to demonstrate that a system is in place for gaining students informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching. The visitors therefore require the education provider to implement formal protocols for obtaining consent from students (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme) and for

managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching (such as alternative learning arrangements).

#### **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 provide evidence of the mechanisms in place that ensure students who have been awarded an MSc Audiology by other education providers and then undertake the certificate in clinical competency (CCC) awarded by University of Manchester, meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

**Reason:** The visitors noted the approved programme that leads to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register is the MSc Audiology in combination with the clinical competency certificate (CCC), both awarded by University of Manchester. The visitors were satisfied the learning outcomes ensure those who successfully complete the MSc Audiology in combination with the clinical competency certificate (CCC) from the University of Manchester, meet the standards of proficiency for the hearing aid dispenser part of the Register. A significant number of the standards of proficiency are mapped against the MSc Audiology programme and the rest are mapped on the clinical competency certificate (CCC). Through discussion with the programme team it was stated the education provider accepts students on to the clinical competency certificate (CCC) who have been awarded an MSc from other education providers. The visitors noted that although a small number of UK education providers offer the MSc Audiology programme, not all are HPC approved. It is the combination of the learning outcomes associated with both the MSc Audiology and the clinical competency certificate (CCC) that ensure anybody who successfully completes both awards will meet the standards of proficiency. With this evidence the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures students admitted to the programme with an MSc Audiology by other education providers would be able to fully meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the register.

The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate the education provider has mechanisms in place that ensure students who have been awarded an MSc Audiology by other education providers and then undertake the certificate in clinical competency (CCC) awarded by University of Manchester, meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider using the accreditation of prior learning mechanisms for applicants who have been awarded an MSc Audiology by other education providers and then undertake the certificate in clinical competency (CCC) awarded by University of Manchester.

**Reason:** The visitors noted the approved programme that leads to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register is the MSc Audiology in combination with the clinical competency certificate (CCC), both awarded by University of Manchester. The visitors were satisfied the learning outcomes ensure those who successfully complete the University of Manchester MSc Audiology in combination with the clinical competency certificate (CCC), meet the standards of proficiency for the hearing aid dispenser part of the Register.

Through discussion with the programme team it was stated the education provider accepts students on to the clinical competency certificate (CCC) who have been awarded an MSc from other education providers. The visitors recommend the education provider should consider using the accreditation of prior learning mechanisms that are in place for applicants who have been awarded an MSc Audiology by other education providers. Using accreditation of prior learning mechanisms will ensure that all prior learning is mapped against the learning outcomes for the programme and all relevant standards of proficiency are covered.

### **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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to further highlight learning outcomes specific to the hearing aid dispenser part of the Register.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the delivery of hearing aid specific content ensures that those who successfully complete the programme can meet the relevant standards of proficiency. The visitors noted that the 'Professional Skills and Aural Rehabilitation' module incorporate professional issues and topics associated with hearing aid dispensing. The visitors also noted that students receive lectures from hearing aid dispensers and that some students get the opportunity to undertake practice placements in non-NHS settings. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors highlighted that it was not always clear which learning outcomes are associated with which standard of proficiency. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to further emphasise the learning outcomes that are specific to hearing aid dispensing.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider further developing opportunities for interprofessional learning within the programme.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors noted examples of interprofessional learning within the programme with sessions being shared with speech and language therapy students. The visitors were satisfied that the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group was adequately addressed and therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors also noted that the education provider runs a range of health and social care programmes and recommend that the education provider should continue to develop further opportunities for interprofessional learning within the programme.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing its practice placement audit processes to ensure they are applicable to and include non-NHS placements.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied with the current system for approving and monitoring practice placements. The visitors noted that the education provider has a robust audit process in place for NHS placements. Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted future plans to expand the range of practice placements to include non-NHS placements. The visitors also noted the current arrangements in place where students can go to non-NHS settings for a period of ad hoc placement days to gain a greater insight into hearing aid dispensing and private practice. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider reviewing its practice placement audit processes to ensure they are applicable to and include non-NHS placements. The visitors suggest that this may be an adapted approval and monitoring mechanism for short ad hoc placements but highlight the importance of having some quality safeguards in place at all times.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the mechanisms in place to monitor the attendance of practice placement educators at practice placement educator training and introduce a requirement for refresher training.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with practice placement educators the visitors noted that the education provider facilitates an annual 'Clinical Educator Training Day'. The visitors noted that all new practice placement educators must attend this training before they can supervise a student and that they are expected to attend subsequent practice

placement educator training events. However, the visitors noted that refresher training is not mandatory and the education provider does not outline a minimum requirement for attendance at subsequent practice placement educator training events. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider should consider reviewing the mechanisms in place to monitor the attendance of practice placement educators at practice placement educator training and introduce a requirement for refresher training to ensure that all practice placement educators remain engaged with the programme and up to date.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider developing a system for checking the HPC registration details of practice placement educators in non-NHS practice placements.

**Reason:** Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted future plans to expand the range of practice placements to include non-NHS placements. The visitors also noted the current arrangements in place where students can go to non-NHS settings for a period of ad hoc placement days to gain a greater insight into hearing aid dispensing and private practise. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider developing a system for checking the HPC registration details of practice placement educators in non-NHS practice placements to ensure that this standard continues to be met if the programme increases its use of non-NHS placements.

Bernadette Waters  
Richard Sykes  
Hugh Crawford

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Sheffield
<b>Programme name</b>	Doctor of Educational and Child Psychology (DEdCPsy)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Educational psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	25 – 25 April 2012

## 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 1 June 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. 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 3 July 2012. 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 23 August 2012.

## 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 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	Peter Branston (Educational psychologist) Trevor Holme (Educational psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	10
First approved intake	January 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Jerry Wellington (University of Sheffield)
Secretary	Ann Whorton (University of Sheffield)
Members of the joint panel	Jane Turner (British Psychological Society) Dilanthi Weerasinghe (British Psychological Society) Laura Cockburn (British Psychological Society) Yvonne Walker (British Psychological Society) Rupal Nathwani (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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

The HPC did not review descriptions of modules prior to the visit as the programme is not based around a modular structure.

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 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.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revise all programme documentation including website and paper advertising materials, to clearly highlight the potential distances students may be required to travel when attending placements and any additional personal costs associated with taking up a place on the programme.

**Reason:** Through discussions with students the visitors noted the distances students may be required to travel when attending placements could be significant and that students are required to self-fund the costs associated with attending placement. The visitors also noted discussions with the programme team where it was stated students cover costs associated with completing a criminal conviction check. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to determine where applicants and students would find out about the logistical arrangements associated with placements, including information about the potential distances students may be required to travel when attending placements. The visitors were also unable to determine where applicants and students would find out about costs associated with criminal record checks.

This lack of information about likely placement locations and subsequent costs associated with taking up a place on the programme may mean applicants cannot make an informed decision about whether to take up a place on the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation, including all advertising materials, to clearly highlight the potential distances students may be required to travel when attending placements, any additional personal costs associated with attending placements and costs associated with criminal conviction checks.

### **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, to ensure the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) entry criteria are clear and if necessary provide evidence that demonstrates how the programme will ensure those who successfully complete the programme will be able to meet SOP 1b.3.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted the IELTS level for entry on to the programme was 6.5. At the visit the programme team stated the level was going to change to 7. If students enter the programme with an IELTS score of 6.5 the visitors require evidence of how the programme team ensures that upon successful completion of the programme a student will be able to meet standard of proficiency 1b.3 (be able to communicate in English to the standard equivalent to level 7 of the International English Language

Testing System, with no element below 6.5) However, if the programme team change the level required for admission then the visitors require the IELTS entry level to the programme to be clarified and clearly stated in the programme documentation and advertising materials.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and outline a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal system for approving and monitoring placements. The visitors were made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements. The visitors noted discussions with the programme team where it was stated that all placements would be contacted and visited by a member of the programme team and the Fieldwork Placement Information Form would be used as a framework to ensure placements are safe and supportive. However, the visitors did not have enough evidence from the documentation provided, to demonstrate a thorough and effective system is in place for the approval and monitoring of placements. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the education providers auditing process along with any policies and procedures used to support the approval and monitoring of all placements settings.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must ensure practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice educator training prior to working with students.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussions at the visit indicated there were arrangements for training sessions held for practice placement educators on this programme. In discussion at the visit it was indicated that it was expected practice placement educators undertake the training prior to working with students. The visitors also noted discussions with the programme team where it was stated practice placement educators who had undertaken supervisory training with other education providers would be able to supervise students from the University of Sheffield. The visitors were concerned practice placement educators could supervise students without programme specific knowledge and understanding of the way the programme delivers the curriculum and covers the standards of proficiency. The visitors therefore require evidence that demonstrates that all practice placement educators undertake appropriate and programme specific practice educator training prior to working with students.

## Recommendations

### **4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider further enhancing the involvement of service users in teaching and learning activities.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors noted some good examples of where service users have been involved in teaching activities within the programme. The visitors noted that individual members of the programme team had facilitated sessions involving service users. The visitors recommend the education provider may want to further enhance the involvement of service users in teaching and learning activities and take a more joined-up approach to service user engagement across the programme. Approaches might include involving service users within admissions processes, in teaching and learning activity, assessment of student performance and influencing curriculum design.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the placement audit processes to record further evidence and action plan areas for development.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted the Fieldwork Placement Information Form that is used as an audit tool and covers issues such as health and safety. The visitors noted it contains a number of yes or no questions and does not give scope to record detailed audit information. The visitors also noted that there is no guidance in place to outline what is acceptable evidence and what constitutes non-compliance. The visitors finally noted the Fieldwork Placement Information Form gives limited scope to record information about the practice placement educator. The visitors recommend the education provider should consider reviewing the placement audit processes to record further evidence, action plan areas for development and record greater detail about the practice placement educator's knowledge, skills and experience. The visitors noted that the education provider may want to consider using the standards of education and training in SET 5 as an audit framework.

Peter Branston  
Trevor Holme

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme name</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsychol)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	20 – 21 March 2012

## 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 '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 17 May 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. 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 June 2012. 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 5 July 2012.

## 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 education provider and 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	Laura Golding (Clinical psychologist) Richard Kwiatkowski (Counselling/Occupational psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ben Potter
Proposed student numbers	13
First approved intake	January 1994
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Peter Smith (University of Southampton)
Secretary	Sean Withill (University of Southampton)
Members of the joint panel	Julie Hadwin (Internal panel member) Steve Tee (Internal panel member) Michael Maltby (External panel member) Eve Knight (British Psychological Society) Andrew Vidgen (British Psychological Society) France Blumenfield (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (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 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 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.

## 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 programme team must provide further evidence of how applicants to the programme are made aware there is no accreditation of prior (experiential) learning on entry to the programme.

**Reason:** In reviewing the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not identify where potential applicants were informed about the rationale regarding accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme. Through discussions at the visit it became clear the education provider does not accredit the prior (experiential) learning of applicants to the programme. The visitors articulated they did not have sufficient evidence to determine how this policy is communicated. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the programme admissions information clearly articulates this information about the AP(E)L policy. In this way the visitors can ensure potential applicants are able to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must clarify the requirements for student progression through the programme and clarification of the terms of achievement.

**Reason:** In reviewing the programme documentation the visitors noted some variability in the terminology to describe achievement within the programme. In particular they noted some terminology differed when referring to the results of assessment. For example, in the Academic research handbook (p 93-95) there are references to the achievement of a pass; pass with minor amendments; pass with modest amendments and; a low pass. In the same handbook (p122) there are also references to the achievement of a 'fail and resubmit'. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified these different terms were used to describe the different levels of possible achievement associated with different assessments across the programme. However, in discussions with students it seemed that this variety in the terminology used could be confusing and students often focused on the words 'pass' or 'fail' to determine their relative achievement in an assessment, whereas the different terminology and descriptors suggested outcomes were different. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team ensure the information provided to students clearly specifies the criteria for achievement across different assessments. In this way the visitors can be sure that students are made aware of the requirements for progression through the programme and how 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 include a clear statement in the programme documentation to state that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy specific to the programme. From conversations with the programme team the visitors were satisfied with the current arrangements regarding the external examiners for the programme. However, they require further evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner have been included in the documentation to demonstrate this standard is met.

## 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 consolidating the information about entry requirements and include it in all relevant advertising materials.

**Reason:** In reviewing the programme documentation, the visitors noted the information required by applicants was included throughout the variety of advertising materials provided. The visitors also noted that there was no one complete set of information which included all criteria, evidence and checks that an applicant would need to demonstrate or undertake in order to take up a place on the programme. Instead information is provided on the relevant websites and the in e-handbooks in a more disparate format which could lead to applicants making decisions to apply when they do not have all of the facts they require. The visitors therefore recommend the programme team consolidate this information and include the complete set as part of the information in all relevant advertising materials. In this way the programme team may be able to better ensure that applicants are fully informed of the criteria that need to be met in order to take up a place on the programme.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider increasing the flexibility around the requirement for applicants to have a 2:1 undergraduate degree or to have undertaken 'suitably rigorous' postgraduate study.

**Reason:** In reviewing the programme documentation the visitors noted successful applicants to the programme are required to have achieved a 2:1 undergraduate degree or undertaken 'academically rigorous' postgraduate level study. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard was met. However, the visitors could not determine from the documentation provided why the academic criteria had been set at this level. In discussion with the programme team it was highlighted this programme requires a high level of research competence and this academic criteria for selection better ensures students can meet this requirement. The programme team also highlighted the consideration regarding academic rigour in post graduate study would be based on the research content of any programme along with the specific area in which it had been conducted. The visitors articulated these academic requirements could limit the pool of suitable candidates from which the programme could select their students and potentially have a negative effect on any widening participation activities. The visitors therefore recommend the programme team consider the reasoning and evidence for these criteria and look to increase the flexibility around the requirements if possible.

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

**Recommendation:** The programme team should consider the equality and diversity data that is provided to the programme team from the Clearing House and how best to utilise this in the implementation of the education providers' equality and diversity policy.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were made aware that equality and diversity policies are in place and are implemented and monitored with respect to applicants. They are therefore satisfied this standard is met. However, the visitors noted a statement in the SETs mapping document which said when applying through the Leeds clearing house 'Applicants may give or withhold their consent for data to be used for non-anonymous forwarding of data to clinical programmes the applicant has applied to'. This was followed by the assertion that this data '...may not be used for future selection and must remain anonymous to those involved with selection'. In discussions with the programme team the visitors noted a great deal of the programme team's data about equality and diversity when applied to applicants came from the clearing house. They also noted the programme team were unsure what specific set of information the statement '...non-anonymous forwarding of data to clinical programmes the applicant has applied to' was referring to, how it was anonymised or how it was used. The visitors therefore recommend the programme team consider what information they are currently provided with about applicants, what information they would like to receive, and how best they can utilise it.

## **5.13 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider how the wording on the client information and consent forms can be amended to ensure the relative experience of students is clearly articulated to potential clients.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation provided the visitors were clear students had to obtain consent of clients prior to working with them. In discussion with the programme team it was also clarified that students had to announce themselves as trainee clinical psychologists while on practice placement and in any situation involving a service user. The visitors were therefore satisfied this standard is met. The visitors noted the client information sheet had a statement which says '...trainee clinical psychologists already have a great deal of experience'. In further discussion with the programme team this was clarified as referring to academic experience that the training a student will have undertaken prior to undertaking placement experience. The visitors suggested that this statement may cause some misunderstanding in potential clients or service users if a student has not had a great deal of experience in the placement setting or in the specific, therapeutic techniques which are being used. The visitors therefore recommend the programme team consider the use of this phrase and how it may be modified to better articulate the relative experience of a student to a prospective service user or client.

Laura Golding  
Richard Kwiatkowski

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of the West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme name</b>	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Counselling psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	15 – 16 March 2012

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	12



## 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 9 May 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. 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 2012. 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 23 August 2012.

## 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 as 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) Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ben Potter
Proposed student numbers	14 (between full and part time cohorts)
First approved intake	January 2006
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Dianne Rees (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Secretary	Sallianne Donnelly (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Members of the joint panel	Elena Manafi (British Psychological Society) Victoria Galbraith (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (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 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.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

**Reason:** The visitors noted 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 (e.g. p1 Programme Specification or p10 Placement Handbook for Providers), and that HPC requires students to undertake 450 clinical hours of placement experience (e.g. p19 Programme handbook). The HPC does not 'accredit' education programmes, as a statutory regulator we 'approve' education programmes. It is also the case that HPC does not set a minimum number of hours that a student must complete. The visitors considered the terminology potentially misleading and therefore required the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instances of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of the formal processes in place for the ongoing monitoring of practice placements

**Reason:** From the documentation provided and from discussions with the programme team the visitors were aware of the current processes in place for approving and monitoring all placements. The visitors noted that if a new placement, not on the database of current placement opportunities for students, was approached, the placement co-ordinator would undertake a placement visit to ensure that it meets the criteria of the programme. The visitors also noted that students gave feedback to the programme team after a placement as part of the ongoing monitoring of practice placements. Further discussions with the programme team and the practice placement providers highlighted that due to some of the distances involved the placement co-ordinator would not always be able to visit placement sites. In instances such as these a telephone conversation would be undertaken to determine the likely resources and experiences that would be available to students at these placement sites. However, the visitors could not determine the criteria that were being utilised by the programme team to assess the suitability of placement sites and what formal processes were implemented to ensure that these criteria were being met. In particular the visitors could not determine how, if the number of placement sites were to increase, the programme team would ensure that all placements were meeting the criteria they require. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the formal processes that are in place to ensure that the placements utilised by students have met, and are continuing to meet, the requirements of the programme. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme continues to meet this standard.

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

**Condition:** The programme team need to provide further evidence of how they ensure that practice placement educators are trained to understand how the programme specific requirements for students practice placement experience are applied consistently.

**Reason:** In discussion with the programme team, and in discussion with the practice placement providers, the visitors noted that practice placement educators are not required to attend training prior to supervising students. The visitors were made aware, in discussion with the programme team, that the criteria for selection meant practice placement educators would have the skills and experience necessary to supervise students. It was also highlighted that the practice placement educators also received the handbook for placement providers. However, the visitors could not identify from the evidence provided how the programme team ensures that practice placement educators were fully aware of the requirements for supervision from this programme. In particular the visitors could not identify how the placement educators were given sufficient information about how to contact the programme and in what instance they should consider raising any issues with the programme team. The visitors also could not determine how placement educators were trained to assess students in a clear and consistent way. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensures that placement educators have sufficient information or training to be able to supervise students from this programme. Primarily the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensures that placement educators can assess students to the required standard and that they understand the requirements of the professional suitability policy.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of the formal procedures in place for regular and effective communication with practice placement educators.

**Reason:** In discussion with the programme team, and the practice placement providers, the visitors noted that the placement co-ordinator for the programme was the primary contact on the programme team for placement providers. It was highlighted in these conversations that as this position had been created and filled only relatively recently not all placement providers had yet had contact with the placement co-ordinator. However, it was emphasised that there are strong informal links between the more local placement providers and the current programme team. The visitors also noted in further conversations with the placement providers that they would welcome the chance for closer contact with the programme. The programme team also articulated that they had considered setting up a suitable forum to facilitate this communication in the future. However, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence of how the programme ensures that there is regular and effective communication between the education provider and all placement providers, particularly those further afield. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the team stays in regular communication with

placement providers and what, if any, formal procedures are in place to communicate with providers particularly those outside of the local area.

**5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- the learning outcomes to be achieved;
- the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;
- expectations of professional conduct;
- the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and
- communication and lines of responsibility.

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of how practice placement educators are prepared for placement through an understanding of the learning outcomes a student needs to meet while on placement.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and in discussion with the practice placement providers the visitors noted that practice placement educators are provided with the handbook for placement providers prior to supervising a student. The visitors were made aware in further discussions that this handbook was the source for a great deal of information about the course. In particular it provides significant information about the timings and duration of placement, what the communication channels are with the programme and what the lines of responsibility for the students are. It was also highlighted that students were expected to discuss the aims and experience they required throughout a placement with their placement educator prior to starting their placement. However, the visitors were unclear about what information was provided to placement educators about the learning outcomes to be achieved on placement and the assessment procedures to be used to ensure they are met. In particular the visitors could not determine how the information provided to placement educators ensured that all of the learning outcomes associated with a placement experience had been met by a successful student. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the information provided to placement educators to ensure that they are aware of the learning outcomes a student must meet while on placement and how this is to be assessed. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme team ensures that practice placement educators are fully prepared to supervise a student and assess their performance.

**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 programme team must provide further evidence about how the assessment strategy ensures that students who successfully complete all required placements experience have met the relevant learning outcomes.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and in discussion with the practice placement providers, and students, the visitors noted that students were expected to discuss the aims and experience they required throughout a

placement with their placement educator prior to starting their placement. From this discussion an agreement is reached about what the student will experience and how this will be achieved. In discussion with the programme team the visitors were made aware of the expectation that students would also provide placement educators with a summary of their previous placement experience to inform this discussion. However, it was pointed out in both discussions with the students and the placement providers that this summary was not always available and sometimes was not provided at this meeting. The visitors articulated that from a review of the documentation it was unclear how the progress of a student in achieving the learning outcomes associated with practice placements was charted from one placement to another. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensure that the completion of practice placement experience means that students have met the learning outcomes associated with that experience. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme team ensures that a student who successfully completes the programme has met all of the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of how the assessment of a students' placement experience is rigorous and effective.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and in discussion with the practice placement providers, and students, the visitors noted that students were expected to discuss the aims and experience they required throughout a placement with their placement educator prior to starting their placement. From this discussion an agreement is reached about what the student will experience and how this will be achieved. In discussion with the programme team the visitors were made aware of the expectation that students would also provide placement educators with a summary of their previous placement experience to inform this discussion. However, it was pointed out in both discussions with the students and the placement providers that this summary was not always available and sometimes was not provided at this meeting. The visitors articulated that from a review of the documentation it was unclear how the progress of a student in achieving the learning outcomes associated with practice placements was charted from one placement to another. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensure that the completion of practice placement experience means that students have met the learning outcomes associated with that experience. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme team ensures that a student who successfully completes the programme has met all of the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of the assessment undertaken by students on placement and how this measures the relevant learning outcomes.



**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and in discussion with the practice placement providers, and students, the visitors noted that students were expected to discuss the aims and experience they required throughout a placement with their placement educator prior to starting their placement. From this discussion an agreement is reached about what the student will experience and how this will be achieved. In discussion with the programme team the visitors were made aware of the expectation that students would also provide placement educators with a summary of their previous placement experience to inform this discussion. However, it was pointed out in both discussions with the students and the placement providers that this summary was not always available and sometimes was not provided at this meeting. The visitors articulated that from a review of the documentation it was unclear how the progress of a student in achieving the learning outcomes associated with practice placements was charted from one placement to another. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensure that the completion of practice placement experience means that students have met the learning outcomes associated with that experience. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme team ensures that the assessment of students while they are on placement ensures that they are meeting the required learning outcomes.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of how they ensure that the assessments on placement are applied consistently and objectively.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and in discussion with the practice placement providers, and students, the visitors noted that students were expected to discuss the aims and experience they required throughout a placement with their placement educator prior to starting their placement. From this discussion an agreement is reached about what the student will experience and how this will be achieved. In discussion with the programme team the visitors were made aware of the expectation that students would also provide placement educators with a summary of their previous placement experience to inform this discussion. However, it was pointed out in both discussions with the students and the placement providers that this summary was not always available and sometimes was not provided at this meeting. The visitors articulated that from a review of the documentation it was unclear how the progress of a student in achieving the learning outcomes associated with practice placements was charted from one placement to another. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensure that the completion of practice placement experience means that students have met the learning outcomes associated with that experience. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme team ensures that the assessment of students while they are on placement is objective and ensures fitness to practice.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must clarify in the programme documentation the progression routes and related timings for students from the point of thesis submission.

**Reason:** In reviewing the programme documentation, and in discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that there was some variance in the information provided to students regarding progression through the programme after thesis submission. In particular the visitors noted that the information around the decisions made by the examiners for a thesis at the viva voce stage of examination was different in the research handbook to that in the academic regulations. They noted that some terminology differed, with the terms 'corrections' and 'minor or major amendments' used differently or omitted. The visitors also articulated that the academic regulations links re-submission periods with these decisions and terminology and therefore the variance in the terms used could be confusing to students. The visitors therefore require the programme team to clarify the differences between the use of these terms and what impact the different decisions which can be made by the viva voce examiners will have on a student's progression through the programme. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme team clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within 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 revise the exit awards from the programme to ensure that there is no mention of an HPC protected title or part of the Register in these awards.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were clear that there are two exit awards from this programme a Certificate in Counselling Psychology Studies and a Diploma in Counselling Psychology Studies. The visitors articulated that this standard requires exit awards to be named in such a way that makes it clear that they do not lead to a person receiving them being eligible to apply for registration. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the titles of these awards to ensure that 'counselling psychology' or 'Counselling psychologist' is not included. In this way the visitors can determine how the education provider ensures that applicants, students and the public understand who is eligible to apply with us, and who is not, and that this standard continues to be met.

## 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 programme team may consider including more detailed criteria for successful application to the programme outside of the website

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that the requirements for entry to the programme were clearly stated in several places in the documentation and the website. They were therefore satisfied that this standard has been met. However, in reviewing the documentation the visitors noted that the criteria for successful a successful application to the programme were only comprehensively described on the websites associated with the programme. The visitors recommend that the programme team considers including this comprehensive list, including the requirement for relevant criminal records and health checks, in other information sources about the programme such as the education providers' prospectus. In this way the programme team may be able to better ensure that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order to make an informed decision about applying.

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

**Recommendation:** The programme team should consider updating the programme handbook to better reflect the requirements of the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and from a tour of the learning resources the visitors noted the resources that were available to support student learning in all settings. In discussion with the students it was also made clear that these resources were utilised well to support student learning. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors articulated that in several meetings throughout the visit there had been changes to the information that was provided in the current iteration of the programme handbook, such as the minimum required client hours in first year. They also noted that there were also some proposed changes which were yet to be included in the information provided to students. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team update the information provided to students, in particular the programme handbook, to more accurately reflect the current status of the programme. In this way the programme team may be able to better ensure that this resource is utilised as effectively as possible to support student learning.

David Packwood  
Robert Stratford