VISITORS' REPORTS

Executive Summary and Recommendations

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

Education provider	Programme name	Delivery mode
Anglia Ruskin University	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
Canterbury Christ Church University	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
University of Central Lancashire	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
University of East Anglia	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
University of East London	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	Full-time Part-time
University of East London	BSc (Hons) Podiatric Medicine	Full-time Part-time
University of Essex	BSc (Hons) Biomedical Sciences	Full-time
University of Huddersfield	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
St Martin's College	Non Medical Prescribing	Full-time
South Trent School of Operating Department Practice (University of Leicester)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice	Full-time
Queen Margaret University, Edinburgh	Pharmacology for Podiatrists	Part-time

Decision
The Panel is asked to –

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

Background information

None

Resource implications
None

Financial implications
None

Appendices
Visitors' reports (11)

Date of paper
16 March 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full Time
Delivery Sites	Chelmsford Campus

Fulbourn, Cambridge Campus (former HSHS campus) |
| **Date of Visit** | 23/24 January 2007 |
| **Proposed date of approval to commence** | September 2007 |
| **Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)** | Colin Keiley, Operating Department Practitioner

Steven Oates, Operating Department Practitioner

Alison Nicholls, Dietitian |
| **HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)** | Chris Hipkins |
| **Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):** | Paul Jackson, Head of Department, Faculty of Arts, Law and Social Sciences

Colin Leek, Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Science and Technology

Sharon Waller, Programme Leader, Faculty of Education, Deputy Director of Learning and Teaching

Katie Hide, Programme Lead, Faculty of Health and Social Work, University of Plymouth

Libby Martin, Faculty Quality Assurance Officer, Quality Assurance Division, Academic and Quality Systems Office |

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

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

Confirmation of meetings held

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

Confirmation of facilities inspected

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

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

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1 Annual Monitoring issues relating to the programme currently delivered by HSHS. This programme is now being merged with the Anglia Ruskin programme to form one new programme that will be delivered on two sites.	☒	☐	☐
2 A Major Change increasing the size of the current cohort at the Anglia Ruskin programme. This existing programme is now being merged with the existing HSHS programme to form one new programme that will be delivered on two sites.	☒	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**90** (30 Cambridge site, 60 Chelmsford site)

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

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

Condition: The documentation should be revised to make it clear to students that obtaining an intermediate award will not provide eligibility for registration with the HPC.

Reason: Current documentation available to students does not make it clear that attaining an intermediate award does not make the student eligible to apply for registration as an Operating Department Practitioner with the HPC.

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria including criminal convictions checks
2.2.3 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria including compliance with any health requirements

Condition: The documentation should be revised and resubmitted to make it clear that CRB and health checks must be obtained and confirmed before entry to the programme is confirmed.

Reason: The current documentation suggests that students can be admitted to the programme without completing CRB and health checks first. Currently students are only required to complete a CRB check before participating in clinical exercises.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.
3.3 There must be a named programme leader who has overall responsibility for the programme and should be either on the relevant part of the HPC Register or otherwise appropriately qualified and experienced.
3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The University must provide a list of all staff who will be teaching on the programme, identifying whether they are fulltime or part-time, which sites they will teach at, and which areas of the programme they are responsible for.

Reason: It is currently unclear which staff will be involved in teaching at which site, how many students each staff member will work with, and which areas of the programme they will be responsible for. The leadership of the programme has not yet been confirmed.

3.5 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.
3.6 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Condition: The University must resubmit staff CVs clearly showing professional development and research activity.

Reason: The CVs provided contained insufficient detail to determine whether the staff involved with the programme posses relevant specialist expertise and are engaged in continuing professional development and research activity.

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

Condition: The University must confirm that the new clinical teaching facilities being constructed at the Chelmsford site are in operation before the new programme commences, or provide evidence that adequate transitional measures are in place should the facilities be delayed.

Reason: A new purpose-built facility is currently under construction on the Chelmsford site. Existing facilities provided on the Chelmsford site are sufficient should the new site not be completed on time. Therefore, before the programme commences an assurance is required that the new facility has been completed and is in use, or that steps have been taken to ensure students have access ongoing access to the existing facilities on a temporary basis.

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 University must put in place a written consent process for students participating as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: The current oral consent process is insufficient.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.
4.5 The delivery of the programme must assist autonomous and reflective thinking, and evidence based practice.

Condition: The programme specification must be revised to make it clear that proficiency, not beginning understanding, must be the outcome of the course.

Reason: Current learning outcomes in the programme specification only specify that a student will 'begin to evaluate and analyse the clinical effectiveness of the patients journey through the peri-operative care environment' whereas students should be proficient in this area by the end of the course if they are to meet SOP 3a.1. This reflects an inconsistency between the module learning outcomes and the programme specification.

Condition: The module descriptions should be revised to make it clear that professional conduct and professional responsibility are emphasised throughout the programme in order to ensure that the students meet the Standards of Proficiency upon successful completion of the course.

Reason: Professional conduct and professional responsibility are currently only mapped as learning outcomes in the first module, whereas this should be spread throughout the programme.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.2 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement.
5.8.1 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators must have relevant qualification and experience;

Condition: The University must provide a revised list of mentors identifying their qualifications to act as mentor and when they were last updated.

Reason: The list of mentors provided contained little evidence that the mentor qualifications had been kept up to date.

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

Condition: The University must provide copies of the equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies of the private hospitals involved in practice placements.

Reason: Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that students placed in private hospitals would be provided equal opportunities and not be subject to discrimination.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

Condition: The documentation should be revised to make it clear to students that obtaining an intermediate award will not provide eligibility for registration with the HPC.

Reason: Current documentation available to students does not make it clear that attaining an intermediate award does not make the student eligible to apply for registration as an Operating Department Practitioner with the HPC.

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

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

Reason: The Student Handbook does not make it clear that aegrotat awards are not available for this programme.

6.7.4 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for a procedure for the right of appeal for students; and

Condition: The Student Handbook should outline the process of appeal for students.

Reason: Students did not feel they had been adequately informed about the appeals process.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: **Thursday 8 March 2007**

Expected dates for submission to ETP: **Wednesday 28 March 2007**

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

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

Recommendation: In order to ensure that students undertaking practice placements are adequately supported and are not disadvantaged, it would be beneficial to streamline the assessment submission procedures.

Reason: Evidence was provided that suggested students undertaking placements were unable to submit assignments by the due date due to work restrictions.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

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

Recommendation: All of the documentation associated with the course would benefit from editing for consistency and typographical errors.

Reason: There are a number of inconsistencies and typographical errors in the documentation as currently presented.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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

Recommendation: The programme team should ensure that where inter-professional learning is to be undertaken that students are better prepared for it.

Reason: Students commented that they felt they were unprepared for the inter-professional opportunities that were provided.

Commendations

The clinical skills facilities provided at the HSHS Cambridge site are excellent.
The attendance monitoring systems in place are excellent.
There is a good level of collaboration between the placement providers.

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

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

Visitors' signatures: **Colin Keiley**
                              Steven Oates
                              Alison Nicholls

Date: **25 January 2007**

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christchurch University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma in Higher Education in Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full time
Date of Visit	24 and 25 January 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Mr David Bevan (ODP) Mrs Julie Weir (ODP) Mrs Catherine Wells (OT)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Ms Carrie Sanders Chair and Head of Nursing and Applied Clinical Studies Sharon Campbell (Secretary)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

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

Confirmation of meetings held

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

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐

IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

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

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

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**30**

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

CONDITIONS

2.2.2 criminal convictions checks;

Condition: The programme team must ensure consistency of terminology across all documentation confirming that an enhanced CRB check is a requirement of entry to the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted inconsistencies across the programme documentation in relation to the enhanced CRB check.

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

Recommendation: The team might consider instigating a more formal system of student ODP peer support (buddy system), which could enhance student learning.

Reason: The Level 1 students would gain a greater understanding of the programme through regular dialogue with the Level 2 students on the programme.

Commendations

The Inter professional learning component has been thoroughly developed to enhance understanding of the core skills and strengths of the relevant professions. Members of the team clearly articulated the relationship between these components and the core ODP modules, and presented a sound rationale for this approach to student learning.

The visitors wished to commend the programme team on their collaborative approach to mentor support and development, and on the quality of the partnership with clinical areas.

The visitors were impressed by the level of support provided for the ODP programme by the University. This was evident through its commitment to high

quality resources and facilities and through the continuing development of the programme.

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

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

Visitors' signatures:

David Bevan

Julie Weir

Catherine Wells

Date: 26 January 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	12-13 December 2006
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Alan Mount (ODP Visitor) Colin Keiley (ODP Visitor)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Daljit Mahoon Osama Ammar (Observer)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Ken Mason (Chair, Academic Quality and Standards Unit) Lorna Marie Burrow (Secretary, Quality Team, Faculty of Health) Roger King (External Assessor, Thames Valley University) Andrew Taaffe (Internal panel member) Vicki Culpin (Internal panel member) Nick Clark (AODP representative, HSHS Ltd) Liz Edwards (Observer, Quality Team)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

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

Confirmation of meetings held

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

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

Confirmation of facilities inspected

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

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

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

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**20**

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.2.1 apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation and advertising materials used for the programme to remove references to the HPC in relation to English language entry requirements.

Reason: In the submitted documentation reference is made to a list of various English language qualifications that are acceptable for entry to the programme, but describes them as being approved by the HPC. Though the HPC requirement for registration is an IELTS score of 7.0 with no less than 6.5 in any component, the entry requirements for pre-registration programmes of study are not specified as the documentation suggests.

2.2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation and advertising material used for the programme to clearly articulate students are subject to an 'enhanced' Criminal Records Bureau check. The programme team should also include in the documentation information relating the process of monitoring criminal records and how it is undertaken.

Reason: In the submitted documentation information is provided about criminal records checks but does not clearly indicate that it would be an 'enhanced' check. The Visitors also felt through discussion that appropriate protocols for monitoring criminal records were in place but needed to be made explicit in the documentation.

2.2.3 apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements; and

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to include further information on the health check requirement and make explicit in the Course handbook that students' health will be a requirement for registration with the HPC and that changes in health status should be reported to the programme team through the appropriate channel.

Reason: The Visitors felt the Course handbook provided information about self-declaration of changes to criminal records and that similar information should be provided on matters of occupational health to ensure students are able to meet the Standards of Proficiency at the end of the programme.

2.2.4 apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation and advertising materials used for the programme to clearly articulate the qualifications required for entry to the programme.

Reason: Through discussion it became apparent that further study may be required to provide the relevant academic background in the case of the NVQ qualifications listed as meeting entry requirements. In order to make any additional requirements clear to applicants, the Visitors felt this should be made explicit in the documentation.

2.2.5 apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

Condition: The programme team must submit the AP(E)L policy applied to the programme for non-standard entry.

Reason: Through discussion, the re-validation panel required changes to the wording applied to the programme to bring the policy in line with that of the wider University. The Visitors considered that as a result of these changes the AP(E)L policy will require perusal as it has not yet been seen in its final draft.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The programme team must submit role profiles and information of the subjects and modules which the members of staff will be teaching/delivering on the Dip HE programme. Details of the intended clinical link areas and personal tutor workload should also be provided.

Reason: Although students indicated the programme team were readily available to support students, the Visitors felt that in order to avoid key staff dependency the workload on staff needs to be determined.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to include the form utilised to obtain consent from students.

Reason: Though the team indicated a consent process was in place, no documentary evidence was provided to the panel to allow the Visitors to consider this standard has been met.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and re-submit the definitive documentation to clearly articulate the process for monitoring attendance in the University and placement setting.

Reason: The documentation indicated that attendance is required for 100% of the programme, and through discussion the protocol for monitoring sickness and non-attendance was outlined; however, the Visitors felt the process should be made explicit in the documentation.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation, including the mapping document for the Standards of Proficiency. The redrafted mapping document should clearly indicate where the Standards of Proficiency are being met in the attainment of clinical competencies.

Reason: It became apparent the assessment tool used in placement for the second and third year students has not been fully developed to become a finalised document. Further, some issues of delivery in years two and three were also not in a final state. Accordingly, the Visitors did not feel able at this time to effectively state whether the learning outcomes ensured the Standards of Proficiency were being met.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation and advertising materials used for the programme to amend misuse of terminology related to the HPC and the AODP.

Reason: In some instances the documentation did not clearly indicate the programme led to "eligibility" to register with the HPC. There were also instances of referencing "statutory" registration and the registration of the qualification rather than the

individual. Finally, the distinction between the regulatory and professional body was not made clear in several instances in the documentation.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to include an indication of the IPL strategy and current implementation in the programme.

Reason: In order to be able to determine accurately the impact of the inter-professional learning on the programme, the Visitors feel a clearer indication of how the strategy is implemented for the programme will need to be assessed.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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

Condition: The programme team must submit the list of available mentors at each placement.

Reason: The Visitors were unable to view the list of available mentors at the approval event and feel unable to make a determination of the adequacy of the number, qualifications and experience of the mentors without this information.

5.7.2 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to clearly articulate the process of monitoring and recording placement experience.

Reason: Through discussion, it became apparent the process for recording this information is subject to change as it moves to fall in line with a divisional process. As a result, the Visitors feel unable to consider this standard as met until able to assess the new process of record keeping.

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

Condition: The programme team must submit the list of available mentors at each placement.

Reason: The Visitors were unable to view the list of mentors available at each placement at the approval event and feel unable to make a determination whether mentors had attended the placement educator training.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the audit tool used for placement environments to include confirmation that placement environments operate under appropriate equal opportunities and anti-discrimination polices.

Reason: The audit tool was submitted to the Visitors at the end of the approval event and after subsequent analysis it has been determined that the document does not currently ensure that a placement environment has in place appropriate equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

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

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

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation for the programme to include updated module descriptors and placement assessment schedules for all three years of the programme.

Reason: Through discussion it became apparent that the placement assessment schedules for the second and third years of the programme were being drafted. The Visitor's felt unable to assess the above standards as the learning outcomes could not be definitively linked to assessment. Further, the Visitors wished to determine how tutors would ensure in some modules that students, when given choice, would be directed to evidence appropriate additional learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards will not lead to eligibility to register with the HPC

Reason: Through discussion, it became clear University of Central Lancashire regulations permitted aegrotat awards, but that the documentation did not clearly state that this award would not lead to registration.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to clearly articulate that at least one external examiner must be appropriately registered with the HPC.

Reason: Though the current external examiner is registered with the HPC, in order to ensure the programme continues to meet this standard, the definitive documentation will need to be amended to include the stipulation for registration.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 16th April 2007
Date Visitors' Report submitted to Panel for approval: 28th March 2007
Date Programme submitted to Panel for approval: 31st May 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team should review the resource requirements in the clinical skills laboratories to enhance student learning opportunities.

Reason: The Visitors recognised that budgetary restrictions made certain resource purchases difficult; however, it was considered that alternatives to expensive equipment, such as an anaesthetic machine or operating table, can be located to enhance student learning opportunities.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider redrafting the course handbook to replicate information from the nursing handbook that has relevance to ODP students.

Reason: Though the documentation provided to students was considered effective in providing information, the Visitors felt the identity of the ODP students would be strengthened by producing a key document for them to use and reference for all matters.

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

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

Visitors' signatures:

> **Alan Mount**
>
> **Colin Keiley**

Date: 15/12/06

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Name and titles of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	19 – 20 December 2006
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Alan Mount - Operating Department Practitioner Stephen Wordsworth - Operating Department Practitioner
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Daljit Mahoon Abigail Creighton (Observer)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Geoff Moore, Chair (School of Chemical Sciences and Pharmacy, UEA) Malcolm Adams (School of Medicine, Health Policy and Practice, UEA) Catherine Wells (School of Allied Health Professions, UEA) Helen Booth, (External Panel Member, University of Surrey)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

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

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐

	Yes	No	N/A
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

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

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

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

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	20

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

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

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

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

Condition 2

**SET 4. Curriculum Standards
4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

Condition:
The programme team must redraft and submit evidence that students completing the programme are meeting our Standards of Proficiency There needs to be clear indication that on completion of the learning outcomes, our Standards of Proficiency are being achieved, both in theory and in practice.

Reason:
There is no clear indication within the documentation that every student completing the programme can meet all of the Standards of Proficiency.

Condition 3

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

Condition:
In relation to the statement of 'Conditions for Pre-registration' of the programme in Volume B, it needs to be more explicit in relation to twenty four hour care, identifying where students are required to work outside normal working hours. The programme team must redraft and submit evidence of this.

Reason:
The information presented in the documentation in relation to the requirement for students to gain experience of delivering care out of hours is vague. Students need to have a clearer understanding of the extent of out of hours work which would be involved within the programme.

Condition 4
5.8.2 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators are appropriately registered.

Condition:
The programme team must ensure that any reference to Operating Department Practitioner is removed where a practitioner is not registered with the HPC

Reason:
Operating Department Practitioner is a protected title which can only be used when a practitioner is registered with the HPC. Within the documentation it became apparent that a number of staff members are represented as Operating Department Practitioners when in fact they were not registered practitioners with the HPC.

Condition 5
6.4 The measurement of student performance and progression must be an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation, and use objective criteria.

Condition:
The programme team must redraft and submit evidence within the learning outcomes which clearly indicates the progression from level 1 to level 2.

Reason:
The learning outcomes lacked clarity of the differences between the levels. Students need to be provided with a clearer indication of their progression through the learning outcomes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.
3.3 There must be a named programme leader who has overall responsibility for the programme and who should be either on the relevant part of the HPC Register or otherwise appropriately qualified and experienced

Recommendation:
To continue developing a suitable course leader who is an ODP on the register.

Reason:
The current course director is not an Operating Department Practitioner however they are appropriately qualified to undertake the role of a programme leader. In order to develop the programme and its profession specific knowledge and skills, the Visitors felt the appointment of an Operating Department Practitioner with the relevant academic qualifications and experience would be more appropriate.

3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Recommendation:
The programme team should ensure that if the number of students' increases then so should an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experience staff.

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

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

Recommendation:
The programme team should continue to achieve their own identified action plan in relation to providing equality of I.T. resources across all practice sites

Reason:
There should be parity of IT access for all students on the programme, regardless of the practice site they are based in. This has already been considered by the programme team through their action plan which we encourage.

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

Recommendation:
The programme team may wish to review the way in which IPL is delivered and credited.

Reason:
In light of student comments, it was felt that the additional workload and the way in which the IPL is structured within the programme, students found difficulties in coping with the pressure of the workload and the timings of the IPL sessions.

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

Recommendation:
To ensure that there is a balance between the number of Operating Department Practitioners and nurses acting as mentors.

Reason:
At present there is a bias toward nurses acting as mentors. Attempts should be made to balance this with more Operating Department Practitioners to ensure that students in practice placements have equal opportunity to have a mentor with relevant qualifications and experience from both professions.

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

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

Visitors' signatures:

Alan Mount

Stephen Wordsworth

Date: 15/1/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of East London
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT/PT
Date of Visit	8th February 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	28/09/2006
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Anne Green (Physiotherapist) Carol Lloyd (Occupational Therapist) Pam Sabine (Chiropodist/Podiatrist)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mr Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Judith Burnett, Panel Chair (Associate Head, School of Social Sciences and Cultural Studies)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

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

Confirmation of meetings held

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

Confirmation of facilities inspected

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

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

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1 Annual Monitoring concerns in relation to SET 3, SETs 4.3, 4.7, SET 5 and SET 6	☒	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	110

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

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

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make explicit the selection procedure for the part time route.

Reason: The selection procedures for the full time and situated learning route are given within the documentation but the information about the part time route is not.

2.2.1 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English;

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make explicit how evidence of spoken English will be established in the selection process.

Reason: The course team do not routinely interview all applicants but evidence is required to demonstrate command of spoken English. This is not explicit within the documentation.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum to enable safe and effective practice.

Condition: The documentation should be revised to make explicit that the part time route follows the standard format of the full time route but that there is flexibility for the part time students to 'step on' and 'step off' the programme.

Reason: The documentation is not clear in relation to how part time students may progress and integrate theory and practice components.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make it clear that when the placement experience is not the standard delivery of 5 weeks, the student experience must equate in time to the same experience, even if it is experienced in a more flexible way.

Reason: The documentation is written to suggest that where a placement cannot start on time, a 4 week rather than a 5 week placement will be offered.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

Condition: For summative assessment on practice placements, the final decision must rest with the practice placement educator

Reason: The documentation suggests that the final mark for a placement is derived in collaboration with the student. Though it is acknowledged that engagement with the student in this process is helpful, the final decision must lie with the clinician who is an HPC registrant.

Condition: The documentation should be revised to make it explicit that students must pass the modules at 40%, rather than be subject to 'compensation'.

Reason: This is not made clear in the paperwork.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: **Monday 12 March 2007**

Expected dates for submission to ETP/C: **Wednesday 28 March 2007**

COMMENDATIONS

The situated learning route is innovative and well received by therapy managers, practice placement educators and students.

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

Visitors' signatures:

Pam Sabine
Ann Green
Carol Lloyd

Date: **9th February 2007**

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of East London
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Podiatric Medicine
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT/PT
Date of Visit	8th February 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	28/09/2006
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Anne Green (Physiotherapist) Carol Lloyd (Occupational Therapist) Pam Sabine (Chiropodist/Podiatrist)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mr Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Judith Burnett, Panel Chair (Associate Head, School of Social Sciences and Cultural Studies)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

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

Confirmation of meetings held

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

Confirmation of facilities inspected

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

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

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1 Annual Monitoring concerns in relation to SET 3, SETs 4.3, 4.7, SET 5 and SET 6	☒	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☐
3	☐	☐	☐

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	60

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

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

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make explicit the selection procedure for the part time route.

Reason: The selection procedures for the full time and situated learning route are given within the documentation but the information about the part time route is not.

2.2.1 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English;

Condition: The documentation must be revised to make explicit how evidence of spoken English will be established in the selection process.

Reason: The course team do not routinely interview all applicants but evidence is required to demonstrate command of spoken English. This is not explicit within the documentation.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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

Condition: The documentation should be revised to make explicit that the assessment of the practical competence in Local Analgesia is at Level 3.

Reason: This is not clear from the paperwork.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

Condition: The documentation should be revised to make it explicit that students must pass the modules at 40%, rather than be subject to 'compensation'.

Reason: This is not made clear in the paperwork.

6.7.1 for student progression and achievement within the programme;

Condition: The documentation should be revised to make explicit that the students must have completed successfully the theoretical component of the Pharmacology module prior to commencing the practical component for Local Analgesia.

Reason: This is not made clear in the paperwork

Deadline for Conditions to be met: **Monday 12 March 2007**

Expected dates for submission to ETP/C: **Wednesday 28 March 2007**

COMMENDATIONS

The feedback from the Clinical Educators was extremely positive, in that they felt that the University communicates very well with them, and that this makes their role much clearer.

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

Visitors' signatures: `Pam Sabine`
                             `Ann Green`
                             `Carol Lloyd`

Date: **9th February 2007**

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Name and titles of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Biomedical Clinical Science
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	18-19 January 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Robert Munro (Biomedical Science – Academic) Mary Popeck (Biomedical Science – Retired Clinician)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Paul Scott (Chair) (Dean - Faculty of Science of Engineering Dean) Brigitte Palmer (Secretary) Kirstie Sceats (Observer) Debi Roberson (Faculty of Psychology) Gerry Davis (Faculty of Health and Human Science) Jo Jackson (Faculty of Health and Human Science) Katherine Guays-Atkins (Student) Alan Wainwright (IBMS representative) Jim Cunningham (IBMS academic representative) Peter Ruddy (IBMS clinical representative)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

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

Confirmation of meetings held

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

Confirmation of facilities inspected

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

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

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

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**30**

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The programme team must revisit and resubmit the programme documentation to remove the word 'clinical' from the programme title.

Reason: Clinical Science is also a HPC regulated profession and there is some concern that, through the use of the word 'clinical' in the title, an applicant might not understand that this programme will lead to eligibility to register as a Biomedical Scientist.

2.2.1 apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the materials used to advertise the programme to clearly indicate that although entry to the programme will be possible at either IELTS 6.0 or 6.5, entry to the HPC Register will require an IELTS score of 7.0.

Reason: The Visitors felt the entry requirement to the programme was sufficiently clear but that a student might not take steps to ensure their language proficiency developed unless the requirement for entry to the register was also clear.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: The programme team must revisit and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate how University of Essex has taken responsibility for the management of the placement year.

Reason: Through discussion, it became apparent that the placement environments were managed effectively. However, much of this management was performed by placement staff and the Visitors felt University of Essex needed to take ownership of all placement arrangements to ensure parity of student experience.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate how University of Essex has taken responsibility for the management of the placement environment. In particular, this should include information on how student welfare and well-being is supported in placement.

Reason: Through discussion, it became apparent that there was some disparity in student experience on placement and the Visitors felt University of Essex needed to take ownership of all placement arrangements to ensure students have equal access to support mechanisms.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate how University of Essex has taken responsibility for the management of the placement environment. In particular, this should include information on how University of Essex ensures the adequacy of resources at placement.

Reason: Through discussion, it became apparent that there was some disparity in student experience on placement and the Visitors felt University of Essex needed to take ownership of all placement arrangements to ensure resources and associated learning opportunities were similar at each site.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

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

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

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the mechanisms University of Essex has in place to approve and monitor placement environments.

Reason: Through discussion it was clear that University of Essex had not formalised the processes they followed to ensure the placement environments met and continue to meet threshold standards for appropriateness. As these processes were not documented, the Visitors did not feel able to determine if the number, duration and range of placements was appropriate to the learning outcomes as it was not clearly documented how University of Essex takes responsibility for approving and monitoring placements.

5.7.5 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of communication and lines of responsibility.

Condition: The programme team must revisit and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the role of University of Essex as first point of contact for students and placement staff.

Reason: It became apparent, through shared responsibility between University of Essex and the placement providers, that the Programme Director was not always the primary contact for placement questions and problems. The Visitors felt that University of Essex must document its role in managing the placement experience through a placement co-ordinator on the University staff.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the role of University of Essex in the management of practice placements. In particular, the role of University of Essex in the collaboration must be made clear.

Reason: Though collaboration between University of Essex and practice placement providers was evident, the Visitors felt that University of Essex needed to clarify the enhanced role it will play in the collaboration for an integrated biomedical science programme.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly indicate how academic staff members are involved in the moderation of the assessment of the practice portfolio.

Reason: Through discussion, the programme team indicated that moderation was taking place, however, the process was not documented in the definitive documentation. The Visitors felt the process needed to be formalised to ensure assessment standards were quality assured.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 24th May 2007
Expected dates for submission to ETP/C:

> **28th March 2007 - Approval of Report**
> **5th July 2007 - Approval of Programme**

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.3 There must be a named programme leader who has overall responsibility for the programme and should be either on the relevant part of the HPC Register (for the following professions: arts therapists, biomedical scientists, chiropodists and podiatrists, dieticians, occupational therapists, orthoptists, paramedics, physiotherapists, prosthetists and orthotists and radiographers) or otherwise appropriately qualified and experienced.

Recommendation: The programme leader should seek registration with the HPC through the appropriate route.

Reason: Currently the programme leader is appropriately qualified to undertake the role of managing and developing the programme, however, in attaining registration with the HPC, the inclusion of profession specific skills and knowledge would enhance the programme's potential to develop with the profession.

3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Recommendation: University of Essex should consider the appointment of at least one HPC registered Biomedical Scientist as a full time member of academic staff.

Reason: The input of part time lecturers to the programme ensures that profession specific knowledge is central to the programme. The Visitors felt, however, the programme would benefit significantly from full time members of academic staff who would be better able to dedicate more time to the development and management of the programme.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

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

Recommendation: The programme team should make students aware of the standards of the HPC and the IBMS in the first year of the programme.

Reason: Through discussion with students, it became clear that some were not aware of the role of the regulator or the professional body until they had gained practice experience. The Visitors felt although these subjects were included in the summer school that the students needed the information consolidated at an early point in the programme.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The programme team should integrate subject matter surrounding the biology of disease into the final year of the programme.

Reason: The Visitors felt the third year of the programme directed students towards research topics with a biological or bio-molecular focus. In order to reinforce biomedical science students' knowledge of the biology of disease, the Visitors suggest this subject matter is integrated into the final year in the Issues in Biomedical Science module or the research project.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider applying credit to the placement assessments to further demonstrate the integration of the placement year in the programme.

Reason: The Visitors noted that with a pass/fail criterion the effort and level of attainment in the placement year was currently unrecognised. In particular the Visitors felt the named award referenced the placement learning and therefore should rely on the assessment of the placement in the classification of honours.

Commendations

The Visitors commend the high quality of the documentation submitted for the validation and approval event.

The Visitors commend the evident enthusiasm and commitment of the trainers in the placement environment.

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

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

Visitors' signatures:

Robert Munro

Mary Popeck

Date: 24/01/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma of Higher Education in Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Full Time
Date of Visit	27/28 Feb 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Colin Keiley, Operating Department Practitioner Claire Brewis, Occupational Therapist
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Chris Hipkins
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dr Pat Cullum, School of Music, Humanities and Media (Chair) Dr Janet Hargreaves, School of Human and Health Sciences Mrs Janine Day, Huddersfield University Business School Mr Philip Beckwith, University of Bedfordshire Mr Chris Reay, representing the College of Operating Department Practitioners

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

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

Confirmation of meetings held

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

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

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

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

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	

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

CONDITIONS

SET 3 Programme Management and Resource Standards

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

Condition: A more formal process for obtaining student consent must be put in place, including making clear to students any impact that refusing consent may have.

Reason: There is currently no formal consent process in place.

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

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

Recommendation: The documentation should be revised to make it clear that HPC registration is not automatic at the end of the programme and that the time taken for registration may vary depending on the candidate's individual circumstances.

Reason: The current documentation suggests that HPC registration should be undertaken in the 3 weeks following the course. The programme team explained that HPC registration requirements are explained to students earlier in the course and students are encouraged to begin preparing their applications before the courses finishes, but this could be made a lot clearer in the documentation.

COMMENDATIONS

The HPC Visitors were impressed by the broad consultation and collaboration that had taken place with placement providers and students in the redevelopment of the programme.

The programme is soundly managed with excellent examples around student support and the management of practice placements.

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

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

Visitors' signatures:

`Colin Keiley`
`Claire Brewis`

Date: 1 March 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	St Martins College (Carlisle)
Name and titles of programme(s)	Non Medical Prescribing
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PT / Flexible
Date of Visit	25th January 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	October 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Dr Brian Ellis – Head of Radiography, School of Health & Social Care – Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of HPC Visitor unable to attend	Mr Marcus Bailey – participated via correspondence
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Daljit Mahoon – Executive Officer
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Tony Ewens - Head of Division, Education Studies - Chair Caron Jackson - Quality Assurance & Standards Unit - Secretary Sam Sherrington - NHS North West

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

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

Confirmation of meetings held

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

Confirmation of facilities inspected

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

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

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

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	60

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

CONDITIONS

Condition

SET 6. Assessment Standards
6.7.5 Assessment Regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition:
In line with Set 6.7.5, evidence must be provided that demonstrates compliance with the standard governing the appointment of an external examiner.

Reason:
Within the Sets mapping document it stated that the process for appointing a suitable external examiner is being carried out but has not yet been fulfilled. A suitable external examiner who is in compliance with this standard must be appointed prior to the start of this programme.

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET: 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;
5.7.2 timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;
5.7.2 timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;
5.7.3 expectations of professional conduct;
5.7.4 the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure; and
5.7.5 communication and lines of responsibility.

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

Recommendation:
Review the level of engagement involved with the mentors induction programme and identify way of enhancing it.

Reason:
Evidence was provided of mentor induction and support which fulfilled the standards for Sets 5.7 and 5.8.3. However, improvements could be made to strengthen communication, support and training for mentors which would enhance the programme further.

Commendations

1) **Clear evidence of genuine partnership between the Strategic Health Authority and the Higher Education Institution.**

2) **Clear evidence of a cohesive and supportive team with a strong commitment to student support**

3) **A commitment to extending the practice of non-medical prescribing to other health professionals**

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

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

Deadline for condition to be met: 4th May 2007

Visitors' signatures:

Dr Brian Ellis

Mr Marcus Bailey **- By Correspondence**

Date: 29/1/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	South Trent School of Operating Department Practice – University of Leicester
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma in Higher Education Operating Department Practitioner
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	7th – 8th February 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	30th April 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Mrs Julie Weir – H.P. Lecturer, Operating Department Practitioner – LSBU, BUPA Mrs Penny Joyce – Principle Lecturer – University of Portsmouth.
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Miss Daljit Mahoon
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Dr. J. Scott (Chairman) – Director of Biological Sciences & Chairman of the Learning and Teaching Committee – University of Leicester Mr N. Siesage – (Secretary) – Principal Assistant Registrar, Faculty of Medicine & Biological Sciences, University of Leicester

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

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

Confirmation of meetings held

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

resources for the programme			
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

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

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

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

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**30**

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

> **SET 4. Curriculum Standards**
> **4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.**
> **4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.**
>
> **Condition:** The programme team must redraft and submit evidence ensuring the programme is mapped to the requirements of the curriculum guidance (AODP curriculum 2006 version 4)
>
> **Reason:** The current documentation for this programme has not been mapped to the curriculum guidance (AODP curriculum 2006 version 4). The visitors need to be provided with evidence to show that the programme has been brought in line to the guidance.

Condition 2
> **SET 6. Assessment standards**
> **6.7 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:**
> **6.7.1 for student progression and achievement within the programme;**
>
> **Condition:** The programme team must provide explicit information regarding the assessment regulations in the student handbook and programme specification (Page 24, section 7.5). This is in relation to progression and achievement in particular the referrals process.
>
> **Reason:** The visitors felt that information regarding assessment regulations was not explicit enough. Students need to be fully aware of the assessment regulations including progression and achievement.

Condition 3
> **6.7.1 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme;**
> **SET 1. Level of qualification for entry to the Register**
> **The Council normally expects that the threshold entry routes to the Register will be the following:**
> **1.1.5 Diploma of Higher Education in Operating Department Practice for Operating Department Practitioners.**

Condition: Any reference made within the documentation implying automatic registration (pages 6, 24 & 25 in the programme information booklet) needs to be reworded.

Reason: Using this terminology is misleading for students. On completion of the programme students are eligible to apply for registration. Registration is not an automatic process.

Condition 4

6.7.3 for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: A statement needs to be added to the handbook to ensure that the aegrotat award does not provide eligibility to the register.

Reason: There was no information within the documentation regarding an aegrotat award. Students should be provided with this information and it should be included within the documentation.

Condition 5

SET 6. Assessment Standards
6.7.5 Assessment Regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition:
In line with Set 6.7.5, evidence must be provided that demonstrates compliance with the standard governing the appointment of an external examiner.

Reason:
The programme team assured that the process for appointing a suitable external examiner is being carried out but has not yet been fulfilled. Evidence needs to be provided ensuring this set will be met.

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.7 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be used effectively.
3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

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

Recommendation: To review the provision of resources, such as the library stock, particularly in this campus.

Reason: Students at present do not have convenient access to books at this site.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should continue to look to develop some clinical skills facilities as soon as possible

SET 4. Curriculum Standards
4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The proposed programme changes highlighted by the course team should be clearly articulated in the HPC annual monitoring.

Commendations

1) The visitors were impressed that students are given core texts at the start of the programme.

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

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

Deadline for Conditions to Be Met: 1st March 2007
To be submitted to Education and Training Committee on: 28th March 2007

Visitors' signatures:

Mrs Julie Weir

Mrs Penny Joyce

Date: 16/2/2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Pharmacology for Podiatrists
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	Part time
Date of Visit	28 February 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 07
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Pam Sabine (Podiatrist) Anne Wilson (Podiatrist)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Abigail Creighton
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Richard Bent (Chair) Linda Graham (Secretary) Alison Barlow (Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

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

Confirmation of meetings held

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

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐

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

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

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

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	20 (as part of the MSc Theory of Podiatric Surgery programme) 20 (as a stand alone programme)

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

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

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the admissions criteria to ensure that all applicants have the statutory entitlement to administer local anaesthetics. The programme team must amend the advertising and recruitment information to make sure applicants are aware of these changes to the admissions criteria.

Reason: The statutory entitlement to administer and supply prescription only medicines is an extension of the statutory entitlement to administer local anaesthetics. Applicants need to be trained and competent in the administration of local anaesthetics in order to embark on this 'prescription only medicine' programme. Applicants need to know the admissions requirements for this programme, so they can make an informed choice about when to apply for this programme, as they may need to complete training in local anaesthetics beforehand.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

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

Condition: The programme team must clarify the assessment pass marks for each the components in the programme.

Reason: The assessment pass marks listed in the programme documentation are currently not the same as those discussed with the programme team. Clarification is needed as to the overall module pass mark and the pass mark for both the coursework and examination component. It is important that the pass marks ensure that students who successfully complete the programme can administer relevant prescription only medicines, interpret any relevant pharmacological history and recognise potential consequences for patient treatment in a safe and skilful manner. It is also important that students receive accurate and easy to understand information.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 9 March 2007
Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 28 March 2007
Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 28 March 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

Recommendation: All Podiatrists in the programme team, who do not hold the statutory entitlement to administer and supply prescription only medicines should be encouraged to complete this programme (or an equivalent).

Reason: The visitors wished to encourage Podiatrists (without the prescription only medicine entitlement) to complete this programme, or an equivalent. The visitors were confident that the current programme team contained the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge needed to delivery a sound programme, but as best practise, felt the Podiatrists may wish to bring their own specific expertise and knowledge to the programme to help improve the overall student experience.

COMMENDATIONS

The visitors wish to commend the enthusiasm and attention to detail shown by the Head of Faculty and their team and their innovation in the area of Web CT.

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

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

Visitors' signatures:

Pam Sabine

Anne Wilson

Date: 1 March 2007