

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme name	Local Anaesthesia for HPC registered podiatrists
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Chiropodist / Podiatrist
Relevant entitlement(s)	Local anaesthetic
Date of visit	12 January 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 'Chiropodist' or 'Podiatrist' 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.

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. At the Committee meeting on 12 June 2012 the programme was approved. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring

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 continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standard of proficiency (SOP) for this entitlement.

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	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Alison Wishart (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Victoria Adenugba
Proposed student numbers	20 per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approval	October 2012
Chair	Douglas McBean (Queen Margaret University)
Secretary	Dawn Martin (Queen Margaret University)
Members of the joint panel	Sara Wood (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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review any external examiners' reports prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme 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) Podiatry programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet the standard of proficiency (SOP) for this entitlement.

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

The visitors agreed that 40 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 17 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must provide details of the programmes security within the education provider.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors received no documentary evidence of the business plan and rationale for the development of this programme. Through discussions with the senior managers the visitors learnt that this programme had been developed to meet the demand from The Institute of Chiropodists and Podiatrists who had some members who wanted to expand their scope of practice and gain the Local Anaesthesia (LA) annotation on their HPC registration. At the visit the visitors also learnt from both the senior management and programme team that the expected cohort would be 20 per year with the staff who currently work on the other podiatry programmes working on this new programme. The visitors considered that there was insignificant evidence provided to show the security of this programme, or how this programme would run alongside the existing podiatry programmes and how the staffing provision would work. The visitors require further evidence to ensure that the programme is secure within the education provider, is not under any threat and has enough support.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide details of the management structure for this programme and clearly highlight roles and responsibilities.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team and a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unclear about the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved in this programme. The visitors noted that this programme would run whilst existing podiatry programmes were running and that staff from the existing programmes would also work on this programme. However, the visitors received no further evidence to show the management structure of this programme or the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved to illustrate the systems in place to manage this programme alongside the existing podiatry programmes. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that this programme is effectively managed.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure there are systems in place for the monitoring and evaluation of this programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit there was no documentary evidence provided regarding the formal processes in place for the regular monitoring and evaluation of this programme and the initial and ongoing monitoring of its placements. Through discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that the external examiners who monitored the undergraduate podiatry programme were

expected to also monitor this programme. However, the visitors did not receive further information to show how the education provider acts upon the information gathered and about the overall processes by which the programme team would regularly evaluate the programme's effectiveness including the approval and monitoring of placements. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to ensure that this programme and its placements have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate further information about the resources to support student learning in their programme documentation.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to this visit provided information regarding the Learning Resource Centre (LRC), academic staffing on the programme and support available for students with disabilities (Submission Document, Local Anaesthesia for HPC Podiatrists, Module Handbook). Through discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that an induction to the LRC was available to students, personal academic tutors and pastoral support would be allocated to each student, and student support facilities were available to all students enrolled with the education provider. The visitors considered that there were sufficient resources available to support student learning however inadequate information was provided to students about the resources and how they could be accessed at placements. The visitors noted that this information was available online but it was not directed to or made available in the documentation provided to students. To ensure that students are aware of all the resources available to support their learning, the visitors require the programme documentation to be revisited.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate all aspects of the students' complaints processes to students.

Reason: The SETs mapping document submitted indicated that the education provider's general complaints process would be applicable to this programme. However the documentation submitted prior to this visit (Submission Document, Local Anaesthesia for HPC Podiatrists, Module Handbook) provided no information regarding the general complaints procedure and was not clear in articulating that they could be found within the 'QMU Assessment and Registration Regulations' section of the website. The visitors considered that the general complaints process was sufficient however inadequate information was provided to students about the process or where it could be found. The visitors noted that this information was available online but it was not clearly directed to or made available in the documentation provided to students. The visitors require further information to ensure that students are aware of how their concerns about the programme or allegations of harassment or discrimination would be dealt.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate areas of the programme where attendance is mandatory and monitored and highlight the consequences of missing any compulsory element.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to this visit did not articulate what elements of the programme required mandatory attendance or how this would be monitored. Through discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that Block 1 (the theoretical module) is a mandatory element that students must attend and pass before they could go onto Block 2 (the placement module). The visitors were concerned that the lack of information provided to students about attendance could lead to students not attending all or some of Block 1 and still be able to pass onto Block 2 upon appeal if the mandatory attendance of Block 1 was not made clear. To ensure that all students are safe to practise in Block 2 the visitors therefore require further information that clearly outlines to students where attendance is mandatory, the consequences of missing any mandatory element and associated monitoring mechanisms.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate all aspects of the students' fitness to practise committee to students.

Reason: The SETs mapping document submitted indicated that the Education provider's fitness to practice committee would be used to "deal with relevant concerns / complaints about healthcare students profession related conduct." However documentation submitted prior to this visit (Submission Document, Local Anaesthesia for HPC Podiatrists, Module Handbook) provided no information regarding students' profession-related conduct or the fitness to practice committee. The visitors considered that the fitness to practice committee was sufficient however inadequate information was provided to students about this or where it could be found. The visitors noted that this information was available online but it was not clearly directed to or made available in the documentation provided to students. The visitors therefore require the further information that clearly articulates the students' profession-related conduct and the fitness to practise process to students.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise programme documentation to clearly articulate the requirement for reflective thinking within student logbooks.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team and practice placement educators the visitors learnt that the logbook was for students to complete and provide reflective thinking after they completed a local anaesthesia injection. The visitors learnt that the students' reflective thinking was a compulsory part of their logbook. However the visitors felt there was insufficient space set aside for

reflective thinking within the logbook and there was no articulation about the compulsory need for students to undertake reflective thinking. The visitors were concerned that without clear articulation that recording reflective thinking was compulsory some students would not do so leading to discrepancies in what the students submitted. The visitors also considered that the logbook did not effectively encourage students to consider their own practice. To ensure that the programme supports and develops autonomous and reflective thinking, the visitors require the programme documentation be revisited.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure all placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to this visit (Local Anaesthesia for HPC Podiatrists, Practice Placement Handbook) detailed the “Responsibility of the clinical supervisor”, one of which being to “Provide a safe clinical environment which fulfil health and safety requirements and demonstrate compliance with infection control policy”. However no evidence was provided as to how the education provider would check and monitor this responsibility or how students would be informed about the risks and safety issues before or on placement. The visitors considered that there was insufficient evidence provided to show that placement settings provided a safe and supportive environment and that students were clearly made aware of the support available to them whilst on placement. As the programme team have overall responsibility for each placement the visitors would like to receive further information to ensure that the education provider checks the safe and supportive environment of placements and makes students aware of the policies and procedures in place to support their learning.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how they will approve and monitor placements.

Reason: During discussion with the programme team the visitors learnt that the main bulk of placements would be held at Sheffield Chiropody and Podiatry Centre, but if a student was unable to go to Sheffield or travel to Queen Margaret University they could find an alternative placement. However no evidence was provided as to how the education provider would initially approve and monitor placements. The visitors were concerned that the education provider did not have systems in place to approve placements before they used them or how they would regularly monitor placements to ensure they continued to meet the requirements of the education provider. As the programme team have overall responsibility for each placement the visitors would like to receive further information to ensure that the education provider has a thorough and effective system in place to approve and monitor their placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to students.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors could find no evidence of a mechanism in place to check and monitor equality and diversity policies at placements. The visitors were also unable to determine how students on placements would know how to gain access to these policies and what they should do if they felt that they had been discriminated against. The visitors therefore considered that there was insignificant evidence provided to show how the programme team made sure that equality and diversity policies were in place at placements and how they articulated this information to students. The visitors therefore require further information to show how this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Reason: Documentation submitted by the education provider prior to this visit (Local Anaesthesia for HPC Podiatrists, Practice Placement Handbook) detailed the “Responsibility of the clinical supervisor”. During discussion with the programme team the visitors also learnt that all clinical supervisors’ CV’s would be checked before they were approved to supervise students. However no information was provided as to how staff numbers at placements were to be checked. The visitors considered that there was insignificant evidence provided to show how the programme team made sure that there was enough members of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support the students in their learning in a safe environment. The visitors therefore require further information to show how this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: Documentation submitted by the education provider prior to this visit (Local Anaesthesia for HPC Podiatrists, Practice Placement Handbook) detailed the “Responsibility of the clinical supervisor”. During discussion with the programme team the visitors learnt that the education provider would check all practice placement educators’ knowledge, skills and experience. However no evidence was provided of the mechanisms the education provider would use to ensure and monitor these requirements. The visitors therefore considered that there was insignificant evidence provided to show how the programme team approved practice placements educators before they used them or how they

would monitor practice placement educators to ensure they have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. The visitors therefore require further information to show how this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate to practice placement educators the training they must complete before they can supervise students.

Reason: The SETs mapping document submitted indicated that the education provider offered a 'Facilitating Practice Based Learning Module' to all clinicians who take students on placement. Through discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that there was also the chance to observe some local anaesthesia sessions held by the education provider. However the visitors did not receive any evidence regarding the content of the module or how the practice placement educators are made aware of the module or the chance to observe a session. The visitors considered that there was insignificant evidence provided to show how the programme team would monitor and ensure that all practice placement educators had been trained before taking on students and offered refresher training when necessary. They also felt there was insufficient information about when and how the 'Facilitating Practice Based Learning Module' and opportunity to observe a session would be clearly articulated to practice placement educators as it was not detailed within the programme documentation. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to ensure that the training is suitable and that the education provider will make sure that all practice placement educators receive initial and regular refresher training.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that regular and effective collaboration takes place between the education provider and practice placement providers.

Reason: Through discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that practice placement educators would be offered training and the chance to observe some local anaesthesia sessions held by the education provider before they took on board students from this programme. However no further information was given regarding how other regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider would take place. The visitors were concerned that, depending on how regularly refresher training was undertaken, this could be on a yearly basis or longer. They therefore considered that there was insufficient evidence provided to show how the programme team would support a partnership and ongoing relationship with its practice placement providers through the duration of this programme. To ensure that the education provider works together effectively with its practice placement providers, the visitors require further evidence.

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

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate to practice placement educators and students all the information they need to be fully prepared for placements.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to this visit did not fully articulate all the information that a student and practice placement educator would need to be fully prepared for placements. In discussion with the programme team it arose that the 'Facilitating Practice Based Learning Module' would be the tool used to inform practice placement educators and attendance at this was mandatory. Practice placement educators were also offered the chance to observe a local anaesthesia session before they took on students. However, within the documentation submitted, there was no indication about the expected duration of a placement or acceptable number of attempts a student could make in order to achieve their 6 successful injections. The visitors could also find no mention of how to contact the education provider or whom to contact if practice placement educators or students had concerns whilst at placement. The visitors considered that the information provided to both practice placement educators and students within the programme documentation was limited and did not clearly articulate important information. The visitors therefore require further information to ensure that sufficient information is provided to fully prepare practice placement educators and students for 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 education provider must ensure that the strategy and design ensures that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standard of proficiency for this entitlement.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to this visit did not clearly articulate the acceptable duration for a student to complete this programme in. There was also insufficient information in the documentation regarding the acceptable number of attempts a student could make in order to achieve their 6 successful local anaesthesia (LA) injections. During discussion with the programme team the visitors learnt that this programme is expected to last 1 academic year and that students are expected to pass the programme during this time completing both Block 1 (the theoretical) and 2 (the placement). The visitors also learnt that students were limited in the number of attempts they could undertake before they achieved their 6 successful LA injections however some flexibility would be given

as to the number of attempts a student could make. The visitors are satisfied that this programme allows a successful student to meet standard of proficiency (SOP) 2b.4 if completed within the academic year and if students achieve their 6 successful injections within an acceptable number of attempts. However, the visitors were concerned that without clearly articulating the maximum length of the programme or maximum number of attempts allowed, the programme was opened to appeals and there was a potential for a student to complete the programme without meeting the SOP. To ensure that all students are fully informed and upon successful completion meet the standard of proficiency for this entitlement, the visitors require the programme documentation be revisited.

Paul Blakeman
Alison Wishart