

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Strathclyde
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Prosthetics and Orthotics
Date of visit	13 and 14 May 2008

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions	6
Recommendations	16

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 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Prosthetist' or 'Orthotist' 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. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 March 2009. At the Committee meeting on 25 March 2009, the ongoing approval of the programme was re-confirmed. 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 to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions standards, programme management and resources standards, curriculum standards, practice placements standards and assessment standards. 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 an HPC only visit. The education provider 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. The visit also considered a different programme – MSci Prosthetics and Orthotics. A separate visitor report exists for this programme.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Mr Martin Matthews (Orthotist) Professor Jackie Campbell (Lay)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Abigail Creighton
Proposed student numbers	30
Initial approval	1986
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2008
Chair	Mr Robbie Rooney (Scottish Government Health and Wellbeing Directorate)
Secretary	Gabrielle Weir (University of Strathclyde)

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Internal annual monitoring reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review external examiners reports from the last two years (2005-06 & 2006-07) as they do not exist. However, the HPC did review external examiners reports from the 2003-04 & 2004-05years.

The HPC did not request the mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs, as the visitors had received sufficient documentation as part of the earlier minor/major change process.

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 (e.g. 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 40 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 23 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

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

Conditions

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the role of external examiners and the process for their appointment and subsequent reporting

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors received external examiner reports from the 2003-04 and 2004-05 academic years, but not from the 2005-06 and 2006-07 academic years. The programme team explained that the external examiner had been on sick leave in 2005-06 and that the outgoing external examiner never submitted a report for 2006-07. The absence of external examiners reports for two years had not been flagged up as a concern to the programme team.

The programme team explained that two new external examiners had been recruited for the current academic year (2007-08) and that they had already been sent examination papers. However, it was initially unclear whether they had completed the selection process and been formally appointed.

The visitors followed up comments in the reports from the 2003-04 and 2004-05 years about external examiners not being fully utilised. It was explained that they only routinely send exam papers (not coursework) and that they were not asked for feedback on the major changes to the programme. External examiners could ask to see coursework and students when they attended exam boards each year.

There appeared to be a lack of ownership over external examiners and they were not being appointed and used in line with the education provider's regulations. Their limited involvement called into question the effectiveness of the education providers' peer review system as a tool to successfully manage the programme.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the systems used to ensure that placement components of the programme are managed effectively.

Reason: Following discussion with the programme team and placement educators, it was apparent to the visitors that the education provider was not taking ultimate responsibility for placements. The lack of formal auditing and monitoring (reflected in the conditions later in the report) meant that the visitors were not assured that placements were managed effectively. Systems, such as placement evaluations, audits, and partnership meetings, were not in place to monitor and enhance placement learning.

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

Condition: The education provider must develop an appropriate protocol for obtaining students' consent.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit did not detail any protocol for obtaining students' consent. The students explained to the visitors that although there were no written consent forms, it was acceptable to opt out or modify teaching activities for health or cultural reasons, as long as it was discussed with a member of the programme team. The programme team explained that consent was currently obtained on a module specific basis and that forms were signed in some incidences (e.g. wearing orthoses) but not in others (e.g. role plays). The visitors felt that the approach to obtaining consent needed to be revised to acknowledge the wide range of risk factors and provide consistent guidance.

3.10 A system of academic and pastoral student support must be in place.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the academic and pastoral support systems available to students whilst on placements.

Reason: In the meeting with students, the students explained that there were effective support mechanisms in place during the taught part of the programme; however there was a contrast when they were on placement. The students could not recall any placement visits from members of the programme team and although placement educators supported students' clinical learning, they did not offer any pastoral or wider academic support. The placement educators told the visitors that they normally experienced one visit per placement from a member of the programme team. The programme team acknowledged that placements visits were not consistently happening outside of the local region and that a system of reactive, rather than proactive support by email and telephone was in place. The visitors felt that students needed to know how they were supported during their placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify the reading lists for 'Principles of Prosthetic and Orthotic Design 1', 'Principles of Prosthetic and Orthotic Design 2' and 'Principles of Prosthetic and Orthotic Design 3' and confirm the availability of their contents.

Reason: The module descriptors for 'Principles of Prosthetic and Orthotic Design 1', 'Principles of Prosthetic and Orthotic Design 2' and 'Principles of Prosthetic and Orthotic Design 3' did not include any recommended reading. In the meeting with the programme team, it was explained that the documents were still work in progress, but that as they were based on content delivered in the previous version of the programme, the learning resources to support them were available. As the tour of facilities coincided with the exam period, the full stock of periodicals and books was not available for the visitors to see. The visitors felt that the reading lists should be finalised so they could be assured that the resources were appropriate to the subject. They also wished for confirmation that the texts were available, through either library or IT facilities.

5.3.1 The practice placement settings must provide a safe environment.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the arrangements for ensuring that placement settings provide a safe environment, both initially and on an ongoing basis.

Reason: The programme team explained that new placements were approved either by a visit or through a reciprocal agreement with the other education provider delivering pre-registration training in the UK. The visitors saw an example visit report but could not gauge the requirements for approval from the descriptive account. Without seeing the detailed requirements used in either process, the visitors were not confident that a safe environment was assured when the placement was initially approved. Following on from this, they had no assurance that the risks and safety issues in placements were assessed, reduced and communicated to students on an ongoing, routine basis.

5.3.2 The practice placement settings must provide safe and effective practice.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the arrangements for ensuring that placement settings provide for safe and effective practice, both initially and on an ongoing basis.

Reason: The programme team explained that new placements were approved either by a visit or through a reciprocal agreement with the other education provider delivering pre-registration training in the UK. The visitors saw an example visit report but could not gauge the requirements for approval from the descriptive account. Without seeing the detailed requirements used in either process, the visitors were not confident each placement provided for safe and effective practice on initial approval. Following on from this, there was no assurance that resources and placement educators encouraged safe and effective practice on an ongoing, routine basis.

5.4 Learning, teaching and supervision must be designed to encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of initial and ongoing training and/or development of placement educators in the process of supervision.

Reason: During the meeting with placement educators, it became apparent that the education provider provided limited training and relied on placement providers and the prior qualifications and experience of individuals to ensure that placement educators were prepared to teach and supervise students. Placement educators acknowledged that they built professional day-to-day working relationships with students and consequently found it difficult to fail them because of this. They could not envisage supervising a failed student who had to re-sit a placement. The students had varied experiences in their placements, with

placement educators often unaware of their level and having expectations which were either too high or too low. When this occurred, students felt that placement educators struggled to teach or supervise them. The visitors felt that the education provider needed to ensure that placement educators were prepared in supervisory practice, so that students' clinical and professional skills were fostered and developed appropriately.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that placement educators can ensure that students can meet the learning outcomes of the placements within the four month period.

Reason: The revised programme has reduced the duration of placements. There are now two four month placements, instead of two six month placements. They still follow the same pattern – one in year three and one in year four; one covering prosthetics and one covering orthotics.

The senior team explained that the changes had arisen out of a major review and that key stakeholders (including students and placement providers/educators) had been involved. In the meeting with placement educators, they explained that they had completed a questionnaire about the proposed changes and then later learnt of the changes via professional journals and conferences. They were not aware that any changes had been made to the learning outcomes of the placements, nor were they entirely clear of how the taught part of the programme was now structured. There was great concern that the reduced length in placements would not allow students to see a sufficient range of patient/client groups and interventions/devices. The placement educators could not grasp how the education provider expected students to progress in terms of clinical skills over a shorter period of time. Whilst there is much overlap between prosthetics and orthotics, the placement educators felt that modern practice and placement settings were markedly different in the two areas and warranted differing learning outcomes. They doubted whether there was sufficient time to achieve the learning outcomes, particularly in the orthotics placement. Final year students also questioned whether the learning outcomes for the orthotics placement could be achieved within four months.

The programme team identified with the placement educators and students concerns and said that they hoped that all the placement learning outcomes could be achieved within four months. However, they explained that if it became impossible for students to achieve their learning outcomes within this shortened period, then the five week holiday block at the end of the year would be utilised. The programme team were hopeful that the clearer integration of theory and practice in years one and two will prepare students for their placements in years three and four, and thus allow them to consolidate their clinical learning more efficiently. The visitors explained that the HPC does not have any specific requirements on the length of placements and the dilemma they face is not over the length of the placements per se, but over the education provider's confidence that the new length is appropriate to meet the learning outcomes. The visitor need to be assured that placement educators in particular are prepared and able

to give students the placement opportunity they require to meet the learning outcomes set by the education provider; which in turn assure that the standards of proficiency are met upon completion.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify the arrangements and criteria used when approving and monitoring placements.

Reason: The programme team explained that new placements were approved either by a visit or through a reciprocal agreement with the other education provider delivering pre-registration training in the UK. The visitors saw an example visit report but could not gauge the requirements for approval from the descriptive account. Without seeing the detailed requirements used in either process, the visitors were not confident. From discussions with the programme team and placement educators, it was unclear how placements were monitored subsequently. The system appeared to rely on informal communication channels and ad-hoc feedback and be to some extent reactive.

5.7 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:

5.7.1 the learning outcomes to be achieved

Condition: The education provider must confirm the learning outcomes for the two placements modules.

Reason: The module descriptors for 'Prosthetics/Orthotics Clinical Placement 1' and 'Prosthetics/Orthotics Clinical Placement 2' did not contain detailed learning outcomes. The programme team explained that they remained unchanged from the previous version of the programme. The visitors felt that the learning outcomes needed to be included in the documentation available to placement educators and students, so they were clear of what the achievements were.

5.7 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:

5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct

Condition: The education provider must confirm that the learning outcomes for the two placements modules include expectations of professional conduct.

Reason: The module descriptors for 'Prosthetics/Orthotics Clinical Placement 1' and 'Prosthetics/Orthotics Clinical Placement 2' did not contain detailed learning outcomes, so the visitors could not be assured that expectations of professional conduct were covered. The programme team explained that they remained unchanged from the previous version of the programme. The placement educators said that the clinical assessment did not focus on interpersonal skills.

The visitors felt that the learning outcomes needed to be provided, so they could make sure that the expectations of professional conduct were clear.

5.7 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the following:

5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure; and

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of the assessment procedures used by placement educators in the two placements modules.

Reason: The module descriptors for 'Prosthetics/Orthotics Clinical Placement 1' and 'Prosthetics/Orthotics Clinical Placement 2' did not contain detailed assessment methods. The programme team explained that this vital piece of assessment was being revised with the intention of developing assessment criteria which can be used consistently and be explicitly linked to the standards of proficiency. The placement educators explained that they currently find it difficult to fail students on the assessment and tend to use the clinical examination to fail poor students instead.

5.8.1 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators must have relevant qualification and experience.

Condition: The education provider must confirm the qualification and experience required for placement educators.

Reason: The programme team explained that new placements were approved either by a visit or through a reciprocal agreement with the other education provider delivering pre-registration training in the UK. These approval mechanisms included a check on the qualifications and prior experience of placement educators. The visitors saw an example visit report but could not gauge how the requirements of placement educators' knowledge, understanding and skills were checked. Equally, it was not clear how changes to placement educators were proposed and agreed, following initial approval. The programme team and placement educators gave contrasting accounts to the visitors. The visitors felt that the education provider must clarify their arrangements for setting and monitoring the qualifications and prior experience of placement educators.

5.8.3 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The education provider must confirm the process for training placement educators. This should include initial training, refresher training as well as specific training to inform current placement educators of the major changes to the programme.

Reason: The programme team explained that they did not provide formal training for placement educators. They said that their initial approval mechanism acted as a safeguard for placement educators' knowledge and skills and that ad-hoc

informal support was available from the placement co-ordinator role. The placement educators confirmed that they had not received initial or refresher training and said it would be useful, especially in the areas of assessment, mentoring and reflective learning. As the students had commented about how placement educators misjudged the level of their theoretical knowledge and clinical skills at the beginning of placements, and the placement educators had said they were unaware of the detail of the new programme, the visitors were keen for the education provider to develop and plan arrangements for placement educators training.

5.9 There must be collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers.

Condition: The education provider must review current arrangements for consultation and collaboration between the education provider and placement educators.

Reason: The placement educators commended the day-to-day communication channels with the education provider and the visitors were confident in these signs of collaborative working. However, the expectations on the placement co-ordinator role seemed unrealistic and as a result, collaboration was limited. There was no opportunity for placement educators to feed back on general, broad areas, either collectively or individually. The placement educators appeared to have a disjointed and somewhat distant involvement in the review and major changes to the programmes, which questions the effectiveness of the collaboration with these key stakeholders.

5.10 The education provider must ensure necessary information is supplied to practice placement providers.

Condition: The education provider must clarify what information is available to placement educators, both initially and on an ongoing basis.

Reason: Placement educators had not received information about the new programme or placement structure and assumed that this was because the new placements were not until the 2009-10 academic year. In general, the placement educators were confident they received the information that they needed to supervise students, however the visitors felt that the education provider should confirm what information they will give placement providers initially and what updates they can expect to receive, with an intention of timescales.

5.11 Practice placement providers must ensure necessary information is available at the appropriate time for both the education provider and students.

Condition: The education provider must clarify what information placement educators are expected to make available to the education provider.

Reason: Placement educators were unclear what information they were expected to give to the education provider and any timescales. The visitors would

have expected a flow of information around areas such as assessment, attendance monitoring, auditing/monitoring procedures.

5.12 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of patients or clients and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that their placement educators' training includes teaching and learning methods.

Reason: The programme team explained that they did not provide formal training for placement educators on teaching. They said that their initial approval mechanism checked the placement educators' previous knowledge and skills in this area. The students raised concerns that some placement educators struggled to mentor students appropriately. In general placement educators were confident in their abilities, but recognised the diversity in training and background of placement educators. As the visitors had no evidence that placement educators were expected to have a qualification in mentoring/teaching or equivalent experience, they felt that the range and use of appropriate learning and teaching methods should be covered in placement educators' training to ensure that the rights of patients or clients and colleagues were respected.

5.13 The placement provider must have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must clarify that placement providers' equality and anti-discriminatory policies are verified.

Reason: The programme team explained that new placements were approved either by a visit or through a reciprocal agreement with the other education provider delivering pre-registration training in the UK. The visitors saw an example visit report but could not gauge the how placement providers' equality and anti-discriminatory policies were checked initially. It was also unclear how they were monitored on an ongoing basis and communicated to students.

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practice.

Condition: The education provider must provide the finalised placement assessment methods, criteria and associated regulations. These must demonstrate clear links to the standards of proficiency and fitness to practice.

Reason: The module descriptors for 'Prosthetics/Orthotics Clinical Placement 1' and 'Prosthetics/Orthotics Clinical Placement 2' detailed the assessment strategy for placements. The programme team explained that this vital piece of assessment was being revised with the intention of developing assessment criteria which can be used consistently and be explicitly linked to the standards of proficiency. This will address the placement educators' comments that the current clinical assessment does not measure students interpersonal skills (so

potentially standards of proficiency 1b). Currently it is not clear from the documentation how students progress through and complete each placement module, what the implications are for failing a placement module, what the resit and retake arrangements are and whether elements of practice are eligible for compensation or condonement. Therefore, it is difficult for the visitors to be sure that students are fit to practice upon completion.

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practice.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the specific requirements to pass each module.

Reason: The requirements to pass each module were listed in the documentation and discussed with the programme team. It was explained that each module had different requirements and that references in the documentation to common regulations were inaccurate and misleading. Clarification is needed as to what constitutes a pass in each module to make sure that students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency. It is also important that students receive accurate and easy to understand information.

6.5 There must be effective mechanisms in place to assure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Condition: The education provider must confirm the role and responsibility of external examiners and provide evidence of the guidance given to them.

Reason: The visitors reviewed external examiner reports from the 2003-04 and 2004-05 academic years and followed up comments about external examiners not being fully utilised. The programme team explained that they only routinely send draft exam papers to external examiners and not completed student work (exam or coursework). External examiners could ask to see coursework and students when they attended exam boards each year. They also said that they were not asked for feedback on the major changes to the programme. The visitors were concerned that there appeared to be a lack of ownership over external examiners and that they were possibly not being used in line with the education provider's regulations. Due to the limited external moderation mechanisms the visitors were unsure how they could effectively assure that appropriate standards were being used in the assessment procedures. In addition, as the revised programme included a shift from exam to coursework, the visitors were also concerned that future external moderation would be reduced even further.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide the placement assessment procedures and update their information about sources of guidance available to students on values and ethics.

Reason: The module descriptors for 'Prosthetics/Orthotics Clinical Placement 1' and 'Prosthetics/Orthotics Clinical Placement 2' detailed the assessment strategy for placements. The programme team explained that this vital piece of assessment was being revised with the intention of developing assessment criteria which can be used consistently and be explicitly linked to the standards of proficiency. This will address the placement educators' comments that the current clinical assessment does not measure students interpersonal skills (so potentially standards of proficiency 1b). Currently it is not clear how aspects such as misconduct, confidentiality and professionalism will be assessed whilst on placement. The current placement handbook referred to an outdated code of practice and the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were not mentioned. Without the finalised placement assessment and updated information, the visitors cannot be assured that professional aspects are an integral part of students' assessment.

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

Condition: The education provider must confirm the regulations on progression.

Reason: The programme team clarified that the documentation contained arithmetic errors and inconsistencies in terms of credit value needed for progression. The visitors were happy with the regulations verbally confirmed to them, but felt that they needed to be clearly specified in the documentation.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify the regulations about their aegrotat award.

Reason: The documentation did not contain any references to an aegrotat award. The programme team explained that the standard regulations did allow for an aegrotat award and that there was currently no caveat to clarify the relationship between this award and HPC registration. The visitors felt that this needed to be clearly specified in the documentation.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider developing a formal policy on student attendance.

Reason: The programme team currently monitor attendance through registers and attendance sheets and address non attendance through academic tutoring. Continual assessment requirements help ensure that students' attend regular, key components. Both students and the programme team explained that there were pockets of poor attendance and there were desires for a more formal system with mandatory attendance defined in numerical or another quantifiable term. The visitors wished to encourage this system as a model of best practice.

Mr Martin Matthews
Professor Jackie Campbell