

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Derby
<b>Programme name</b>	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Occupational Therapist
<b>Date of visit</b>	1 – 2 April 2009

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction .....	3
Visit details.....	3
Sources of evidence.....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions .....	6
Recommendations .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

## 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 'Occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 19 May 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 11 June 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 25 May 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 6 July 2009.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

### Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Wendy Fraser (Occupational Therapist) Jane Grant (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Brendon Edmonds
HPC observer	Neil Strevett
Proposed student numbers	25
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Chair	Colin Fryer (University of Derby)
Secretary	Shelley Nix (University of Derby) Lesley Sawley (University of Derby)
Members of the joint panel	Christine Jones (Internal Panel Member) Ann Minton (Internal Panel Member) Doug Carr (Internal Panel Member) Gail Boniface (College of Occupational Therapists) Catherine Wells (College of Occupational Therapists) Clair Parkin (College of Occupational Therapists)

## Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 60 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

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

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

## Conditions

### **2.1 The 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 education provider must revisit all the programme documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, eligibility to apply for HPC registration is not conditional upon the completion of a pre-determined amount of practice placement hours. Rather eligibility to apply to the register is determined by the completion of the appropriate award for the profession. In the submitted documentation, there were instances of incorrect terminology with reference to the HPC. The documentation referred to the HPC as a 'professional body' providing 'professional body' registration. The HPC is a 'regulatory body', which provides registration complicit with statutory legislation. The visitors considered the terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the documentation (including website information) to be thoroughly reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further documentation that articulates clearly the system used for the approval and monitoring of placements.

**Reason:** The submitted programme documentation did not sufficiently detail the processes that the education provider uses to approve and monitor practice placements. In discussion with the programme team and with the practice placement educators, it became apparent that relevant systems were in place that aim to assure the quality and parity of the placement experience. However, the visitors require further documentary evidence to be satisfied that the systems in place are formalised and are indeed providing a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring placements.

### **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 revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail regarding the policy for aegrotat awards for the programme.

The visitors need to see evidence that this policy is clearly communicated within the documentation to ensure that this standard is being met.

## 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.**

**Condition:** The education provider should consider revising the attendance policy to clearly articulate the requirements and expectations placed upon students.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider clearly articulated that students were required to maintain a minimum of 80% attendance on all modules as per University policy. However, in discussions with the programme team, it became apparent that students were expected to maintain an attendance of 100% for all modules for this programme. The visitors felt that this disparity could potentially cause confusion for students. The visitors recommend that the programme documentation be updated to clearly articulate the expectations of the programme team and how these differ from the attendance standards set by the University.

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

**Condition:** The education provider should consider carefully monitoring the range of placements to continue to ensure they are appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

**Reason:** In discussions with the senior team, programme team and practice placement educators, the visitors noted that the programme was committed to developing practice placements that reflect the 'emerging roles' for occupational therapists. The visitors also noted that the students only undertake 3 placements throughout the programme. With this in mind, the visitors recommend that the 'emerging roles' placements within this programme are carefully monitored. This is to continue to ensure that they are able to provide a placement experience that is appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

### **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 education provider should consider monitoring and further enhancing their communication links to the practice placement educators.

**Reason:** In discussions with the practice placement educators, it became apparent that they often experienced difficulty communicating with the programme team whilst students completing the BSc (Hons) programme were on placement. The visitors recommend that this issue is monitored and appropriate systems of communication are further developed and documented for the MSc programme to continue to ensure that practice placement educators have a clear understanding of the most appropriate way to make contact with the programme team whilst a student is on placement.



**5.13 The placement providers 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 should consider enhancing the audit of placements to continue to ensure that equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies are being implemented and monitored.

**Reason:** The practice placements educators confirmed that equal opportunity and anti-discriminatory policies of the relevant trusts were included as part of the induction process for students on placement. The visitors noted that audits were carried out during and at the conclusion of every placement for the BSc (Hons) programme, although it was not clear as to whether these policies and their implementation were specifically addressed. The visitors recommend that the implementation and monitoring of these policies is explicitly included in any practice placements audits that are conducted. This is to continue to ensure that students are aware of these policies and the procedure to undertake to access them, and that appropriate actions have been taken in instances where an issue of this nature has arisen.

Wendy Fraser  
Jane Grant

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Derby
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Date of visit</b>	1 – 2 April 2009

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction .....	3
<b>Visit details .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Sources of evidence.....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
<b>Conditions .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Recommendations .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Commendations.....</b>	<b>10</b>

## 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 'Radiographer' or 'Diagnostic Radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 19 May 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 11 June 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 25 May 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 6 July 2009.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - curriculum 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 part of a joint event. The education provider and validating body validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Shaaron Pratt (Radiographer) Richard Price (Radiographer)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
HPC observer	Rachel Greig
Proposed student numbers	40
Initial approval	January 1993
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2009
Chair	Doug Carr (University of Derby)
Secretary	Lesley Sawley (University of Derby)
Members of the joint panel	Christine Jones (Internal Panel Member) Ann Minton (Internal Panel Member) Charles Sloane (College of Radiographers)

## Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

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

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

## Conditions

### **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 education provider must revisit all the programme documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, it should be made clear throughout all documentation that HPC approval of a programme does not automatically lead to HPC registration for those who complete the programme but rather to 'eligibility to apply for HPC registration'. The visitors considered that this clarification would benefit both applicants and students and therefore require the documentation to be amended.

### **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 formalise the policy on student consent and ensure that the protocols used to gain consent are clearly articulated to students on the programme.

**Reason:** From the programme documentation and the information supplied at the visit, the policy for obtaining consent from students was initially unclear. It became apparent that an informal consent procedure was applied on the programme, and for the benefit of both students and the programme team this process should be formalised to ensure that all situations requiring student consent were stipulated for and that the pathway for opt-out was clear to the students throughout the programme. The visitors need to receive evidence in the form of a consent policy and the method of obtaining consent (such as a consent form) to ensure that this standard is being met.

### **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 review the module descriptor for Imaging Studies: Preparing for Practice to clearly identify, within the learning outcomes, where students will meet HPC standards of proficiency 2b.4 – be able to distinguish disease and trauma processes as they manifest on diagnostic images.

**Reason:** From the information contained within the module descriptor for Imaging Studies: Preparing for Practice it was difficult to determine where students would demonstrate the knowledge and skills required to meet HPC standards of proficiency 2b.4 – be able to distinguish disease and trauma

processes as they manifest on diagnostic images. The visitors felt that the module descriptor and the learning outcomes need to make explicit that this standard is being met in order to ensure that those who complete the programme successfully attain all of the required standards of proficiency.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further documentation that articulates clearly the system used for the approval and monitoring of placements.

**Reason:** The submitted programme documentation did not sufficiently detail the processes that the education provider uses to approve and monitor practice placements. In discussion with the programme team and with the practice placement educators, it became apparent that relevant systems were in place that aim to assure the quality and parity of the placement experience. However, the visitors require further documentary evidence to be satisfied that the systems in place are formalised, and are indeed providing a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring placements.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must review the module descriptor for Imaging Studies: Preparing for Practice to clearly identify, within the learning outcomes and assessment, where students will meet HPC standards of proficiency 2b.4 – be able to distinguish disease and trauma processes as they manifest on diagnostic images.

**Reason:** From the information contained within the module descriptor for Imaging Studies: Preparing for Practice it was difficult to determine where the students would demonstrate the knowledge and skills required to meet HPC standards of proficiency 2b.4 – be able to distinguish disease and trauma processes as they manifest on diagnostic images. The visitors felt that the module descriptor, the learning outcomes and the assessment for this module need to make explicit that this standard is being met in order to ensure that those who complete the programme successfully attain all of the required standards of proficiency.

#### **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 revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail regarding the policy for aegrotat awards for the programme. The visitors need to see evidence that this policy is clearly communicated within the documentation to ensure that this standard is being met.



## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the programme team revisits the criminal convictions check process in order to formalise the policy both on entry and throughout the duration of the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided and discussions at the visit it was clear that whilst there was a criminal convictions check process in place, a formal policy had not been established. The visitors were content with the information that they were provided with regarding the programme teams' process which is applied for applicants to the programme. However the visitors also felt that formalising this process and providing further clarity within the documentation on these arrangements would be helpful to all parties involved in the programme.

### **3.6 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the programme team continue to pursue staff development in the area of discipline specific research within the radiography department.

**Reason:** In discussion, the programme team indicated that a number of staff members were involved in active research but recognised that staff development mainly focused on learning and teaching. The visitors recognised that the programme team would like to extend staff development to more discipline specific areas and wanted to support this continued development and encourage wider interactions with external bodies in this field, such as professional bodies, with this recommendation.

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the programme team revisits the module descriptor content to fully reflect the learning and progression that takes place throughout the course of the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team it was clear that the module descriptors and the learning outcomes did not always match and therefore they did not always fully reflect the full development of skills over the course of the programme. The visitors were content that the majority of the standards of proficiency were being met on the programme but felt that a review of the module descriptor content and learning outcomes would provide further clarity and reflect the learning and progression taking place. This would therefore be helpful to all parties involved in the programme.

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the education provider continues to review inter-professional learning modules in order to maintain their relevance to all professions involved.

**Reason:** From discussions with the students and the programme team at the visit it was clear that inter-professional modules had been in use for many years and were being developed over time. From comments received by students regarding past experiences, the visitors felt that these modules should continue to be reviewed and developed to ensure that the needs of diagnostic radiography students are addressed, that the content of these modules is relevant to radiographic practice and that tutors have profession specific knowledge across all professions involved in these modules.

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the programme team revisits the module descriptor content to fully reflect the learning and progression that takes place throughout the course of the programme and the appropriateness of assessment methods utilised.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team it was clear that the module descriptors and the learning outcomes did not always match and therefore they did not always fully reflect the full development of skills over the course of the programme. The visitors also found it difficult to determine where all learning outcomes were being assessed. The visitors were content that the majority of the standards of proficiency were being met on the programme but felt that a review of the module descriptor content, learning outcomes and indication of how these were assessed would provide further clarity and reflect the learning and progression taking place. This would therefore be helpful to all parties involved in the programme.

## Commendations

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

**Commendation:** The visitors wished to commend the programme team for the clinical skills laboratory resource.

**Reason:** At the visit the visitors were shown the clinical skills laboratory resource and how these were utilised for patients. The visitors felt that this was an excellent resource that benefitted the community and as this realistic environment and patient experience was accessible for students, demonstrated a level of resource and access that was innovative and of best practice.

Shaaron Pratt  
Richard Price

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Derby
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Date of visit</b>	1 – 2 April 2009

## Contents

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

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 13 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 19 May 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 11 June 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 25 May 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 6 July 2009.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme management and resources standards, curriculum standards and practice placements 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 part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) and BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Wendy Fraser (Occupational Therapist) Jane Grant (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Brendon Edmonds
HPC observer	Neil Strevett
Proposed student numbers	73 Full time 14 Part time
Initial approval	2 October 1995
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2009
Chair	Colin Fryer (University of Derby)
Secretary	Shelley Nix (University of Derby) Lesley Sawley (University of Derby)
Members of the joint panel	Christine Jones (Internal Panel Member) Ann Minton (Internal Panel Member) Doug Carr (Internal Panel Member) Gail Boniface (College of Occupational Therapists) Catherine Wells (College of Occupational Therapists)

	Clair Parkin (College of Occupational Therapists)
--	---

## Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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



## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 60 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

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

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

## Conditions

### **2.1 The 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 education provider must revisit all the programme documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, eligibility to apply for HPC registration is not conditional upon the completion of a pre-determined amount of practice placement hours. Rather eligibility to apply to the register is determined by the completion of the appropriate award for the profession. In the submitted documentation, there were instances of incorrect terminology with reference to the HPC. The documentation referred to the HPC as a 'professional body' providing 'professional body' registration. The HPC is a 'regulatory body', which provides registration complicit with statutory legislation. The visitors considered the terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the documentation (including website information) to be thoroughly reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further documentation that articulates clearly the system used for the approval and monitoring of placements.

**Reason:** The submitted programme documentation did not sufficiently detail the processes that the education provider uses to approve and monitor practice placements. In discussion with the programme team and with the practice placement educators, it became apparent that relevant systems were in place that aim to assure the quality and parity of the placement experience. However, the visitors require further documentary evidence to be satisfied that the systems in place are formalised and are indeed providing a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring placements.

### **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 revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail regarding the policy for aegrotat awards for the programme.

The visitors need to see evidence that this policy is clearly communicated within the documentation to ensure that this standard is being met.

## 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.**

**Condition:** The education provider should consider revising the attendance policy to clearly articulate the requirements and expectations placed upon students.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider clearly articulated that students were required to maintain a minimum of 80% attendance on all modules as per University policy. However, in discussions with the programme team, it became apparent that students were expected to maintain an attendance of 100% for all modules for this programme. The visitors felt that this disparity could potentially cause confusion for students. The visitors recommend that the programme documentation be updated to clearly articulate the expectations of the programme team and how these differ from the attendance standards set by the University.

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

**Condition:** The education provider should consider carefully monitoring the range of placements to continue to further ensure they are appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

**Reason:** In discussions with the senior team, programme team and practice placement educators, the visitors noted that the programme was committed to developing practice placements that reflect the 'emerging roles' for occupational therapists. The visitors also noted that the students only undertake 3 placements throughout the programme. With this in mind, the visitors recommend that the 'emerging roles' placements within this programme are carefully monitored. This is to continue to ensure that they are able to provide a placement experience that is appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

#### **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 education provider should consider monitoring and further enhancing their communication links to the practice placement educators.

**Reason:** In discussions with the practice placement educators, it became apparent that they often experienced difficulty communicating with the programme team whilst students were on placement. The visitors recommend that this issue is monitored and appropriate systems of communication are further developed and documented to ensure that practice placement educators have a clear understanding of the most appropriate way to make contact with the programme team whilst a student is on placement.

**5.13 The placement providers 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 should consider enhancing the audit of placements to continue to ensure that equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies are being implemented and monitored.

**Reason:** The practice placements educators confirmed that equal opportunity and anti-discriminatory policies of the relevant trusts were included as part of the induction process for students on placement. The visitors noted that audits were carried out during and at the conclusion of every placement, although it was not clear as to whether these policies and their implementation were specifically addressed. The visitors recommend that the implementation and monitoring of these policies is explicitly included in any practice placements audits that are conducted. This is to continue to ensure that students are aware of these policies and the procedure to undertake to access them, and that appropriate actions have been taken in instances where an issue of this nature has arisen.

Wendy Fraser  
Jane Grant

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Northampton
<b>Programme name</b>	FDS Sc Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of visit</b>	15 - 16 April 2009

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction .....	3
<b>Visit details</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Sources of evidence.....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
<b>Conditions</b> .....	<b>6</b>

## 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 'Paramedic' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 2 June 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 11 June 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 14 July 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2009.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

<b>Name of HPC visitors and profession</b>	<b>Vince Clarke (Paramedic) Graham Harris (Paramedic)</b>
<b>HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)</b>	<b>Neil Strevett Paula Lescott</b>
<b>Proposed student numbers</b>	<b>25 per year</b>
<b>Proposed start date of programme approval</b>	<b>September 2009</b>
<b>Chair</b>	<b>Doug Rae (University of Northampton)</b>
<b>Secretary</b>	<b>Matthew Watson (University of Northampton)</b>
<b>Members of the joint panel</b>	<b>Philip Garner (Internal Panel Member) Peter Campkin (Internal Panel Member) Sarah Jardine (External Panel Member)</b>



## Sources of evidence

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

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

The HPC did not review the practice placement handbook prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it. However, they did table it at the visit itself.

The HPC did not review External examiners' reports prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

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

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

The HPC met with students from the Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Science as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 35 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 28 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

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

## Conditions

### **2.1 The 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 education provider must revisit all the documentation and advertising materials for the programme and update it to accurately reflect the Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science (FDS Sc Paramedic Science) and to ensure that the terminology used throughout is fully reflective of the requirements of the HPC and statutory regulation.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider made reference throughout to the Diploma in Higher Education in Paramedic Science (Dip HE Paramedic Science), the previous programme delivered by the education and which the FDS Sc in Paramedic Science is designed to eventually replace. There were also instances of incorrect terminology with reference to the HPC and its requirements. In particular, the documentation referred to the HPC as 'validating' the programme, whereas the HPC provides approval for programmes, leading to eligibility to apply for registration.

### **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 education provider must revisit all the documentation and advertising materials in relation to the programme to ensure that manual handling requirements of the programme are made clear to applicants prior to joining the programme.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider made reference to a mandatory skills element of the programme which is compulsory for all students. Within that element students are required to complete and pass a moving and handling component in order to successfully complete the practice placements and therefore the programme as a whole. The visitors judged that the documentation submitted did not clearly articulate the requirements of this element of the programme and implications for the student of not passing the manual handling element of the mandatory skills. Subsequent discussions with the programme team clarified the situation and the visitors judged that the manual handling requirements should be made clear in the information given to applicants prior to joining in order for them to make an informed choice on whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

### **2.2.5 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior learning and other inclusion mechanisms.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and advertising material and clarify its processes, procedures and policies in

relation to the application of accreditation of prior learning (APL) to the programme.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted by the education provider there were references made to the operation of APL in the admissions and entry criteria, but the visitors felt that they were unable to clearly determine from the documentation the means by which APL would be applied to the programme. During the visit a further set of documentation was produced by the education provider that clarified the application of APL, but the visitors did not have time to review this information. The visitors judged that to meet this standard the programme documentation and advertising materials should clearly articulate the processes, procedures and policies in relation to APL that apply to this programme that covers all possible applicants to the programme.

### **3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide a copy of the collaborative agreements that are in place with the East Midlands Ambulance trust in relation to resources provided for the programme.

**Reason:** In order to assess whether this Standard of Education and Training was being fully met, the visitors requested that the education provider supply copies of the collaborative agreements that are in place with the East Midlands Ambulance Trust and ambulance placement sites. This is to ensure that the required resources are available on the programme in relation to placement provision, the provision of additional tutors and the advanced driving courses which they must undertake as part of the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence on its strategy to recruit and develop staff in order to expand the teaching team.

**Reason:** From discussions with the senior team at the visit it was clear that there were plans to provide further staff to deliver the programme. The visitors requested that documentary evidence of the strategy for the development and expansion of the teaching team should be supplied to ensure that there is an adequate number of fully qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of its processes and procedures to ensure that visiting lecturers and hourly paid staff have relevant qualifications, expertise and knowledge.

**Reason:** The documentation supplied by the education provider listed a number of visiting and associate staff that would be employed to deliver the programme. In discussions with the senior team it became apparent that processes and procedures were in place to ensure that all staff had the relevant expertise and knowledge to help deliver the programme. However, the visitors requested

further documentary evidence to ensure that robust and effective mechanisms are in place.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit and update all documentation to ensure that it refers to FDS Sc Paramedic Science.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted by the education provider it was noted by the visitors that there were references throughout to the Dip HE Paramedic Science which included references to a year three of the programme. The visitors judged that this would be potentially confusing to students and requested that the documentation be updated to be clear and unambiguous.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must submit revised placement documentation to ensure that this Standard of Education and Training is being met.

**Reason:** During the course of the visit it became clear that the education provider had updated its programme documentation prior to the visit but that these documents had not been supplied to the visitors ahead of the visit. In particular, it was noted that the Practice Portfolio had not been supplied. Though the updated documentation was supplied during the course of the visit, the visitors were unable to adequately scrutinise the revised documentation within the context of the visit itself. The visitors therefore require the practice portfolio and the supporting documents for placements to be submitted in order to ensure that the Standards of Proficiency are being met on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to review and amend statements that relate to potentially misleading Standards of Proficiency achievement on the programme.

**Reason:** In the documentation supplied by the education provider there are statements noting that the achievement of HPC's Standards of Proficiency were required to be met at every level of the programme. The visitors considered this statement could be misleading to students and the statements should be amended to reflect the actual requirements.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of how they assure themselves that they have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at all of the ambulance placement sites.

**Reason:** From the documentation supplied by the education provider prior to the visit, the visitors judged that it was not clear how the education provider audits and monitors practice placements, particularly ambulance placements. In discussions with the programme team the mechanisms used to monitor and audit were articulated. In particular, it was noted that the education provider was midway through a 5 year plan to audit its placements and half of the ambulance placements had successfully completed this process. Therefore, the visitors requested documentary evidence of the process by which the education provider audits and monitors ambulance placements to ensure that the number of mentors and staff are adequate.

### **5.3.1 The practice placement settings must provide a safe environment.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide documentary evidence on how they audit and monitor practice placements to ensure a safe environment.

**Reason:** From the documentation supplied by the education provider prior to the visit, the visitors judged that it was not clear how the education provider audits and monitors practice placements, particularly ambulance placements. In discussions with the programme team the mechanisms used to monitor and audit were articulated. In particular, it was noted that the education provider was midway through a 5 year plan to audit its placements and half of the ambulance placements had successfully completed this process. Therefore, the visitors requested documentary evidence of the process by which the education provider audits and monitors ambulance placements to ensure safe environments for students.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide documentary evidence on how they audit and monitor practice placements to ensure safe and effective practice.

**Reason:** From the documentation supplied by the education provider prior to the visit, the visitors judged that it was not clear how the education provider audits and monitors its practice placements, particularly ambulance placements. Therefore, the visitors requested documentary evidence of the process by which the education provider audits and monitors ambulance placements to ensure safe and effective practice.

## **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 the final version of the Practice Portfolio and supporting documentation for placements to ensure that this standard is being met.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted by the education provider prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to determine whether this standard was being met. In discussions with the programme team it was clear that informal processes were in place to encourage safe and effective practice, particularly where

allocated mentors were absent through illness when a student was on placement, but the visitors requested that formal processes be put in place and fully documented in order to ensure the student would not be left unsupervised or required to forgo the placement on a temporary basis. Although the Practice Portfolio was provided during the visit, it was in draft form and the visitors could not provide adequate scrutiny of the documentation within the context of the visit itself. Therefore, the visitors requested that the Practice Portfolio and all other supporting documentation for placements should be submitted to ensure that this standard is being met.

#### **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 documentation to accurately reflect and clarify the number, duration and range of placements for the programme in order for the visitors to determine if these are appropriate to the learning outcomes of the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors were unable to determine whether this standard was being met as some of the documentation submitted by the education provider prior to the visit contained conflicting information and on occasion made reference to the Dip HE Paramedic Science. The visitors therefore requested that the documentation should be revised to accurately reflect and clarify the number, duration and range of placements for the Foundation Degree and where they occur in the programme (this evidence could include a programme timeline). The visitors also require evidence of the information that both students and placement staff receive to ensure that all placement information is communicated clearly.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide documentary evidence of how they approve and monitor ambulance placements.

**Reason:** From the documentation supplied by the education provider prior to the visit, the visitors judged that it was not clear how the education provider audits and monitors practice placements, particularly ambulance placements. In discussions with the programme team the mechanisms used to monitor and audit were articulated. In particular, it was noted that the education provider was midway through a 5 year plan to audit its placements and half of the ambulance placements had successfully completed this process. Therefore, the visitors requested documentary evidence of the process by which the education provider audits and monitors ambulance placements.

##### **5.7.1 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit revised placement documentation to ensure that this Standard of Education and Training is being met.

**Reason:** During the course of the visit it became clear that the education provider had updated its programme documentation prior to the visit but that these documents had not been supplied to the visitors ahead of the visit. In particular, it was noted that the Practice Portfolio had not been supplied. Though the updated documentation was supplied during the course of the visit, the visitors were unable to adequately scrutinise the revised documentation within the context of the visit itself. The visitors therefore require the practice portfolio and the supporting documents for placements to be submitted in order to ensure that this standard is being met. In particular, the visitors requested evidence on the information given to students and placement educators on the driving requirements that students undertake while on placement in year two.

**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 education provider must submit documentation to ensure that this Standard of Education and Training is being met.

**Reason:** During the course of the visit it became clear that the education provider had updated its programme documentation prior to the visit but that these documents had not been supplied to the visitors ahead of the visit. In particular, it was noted that the Practice Portfolio had not been supplied. Though the updated documentation was supplied during the course of the visit, the visitors were unable to adequately scrutinise the revised documentation within the context of the visit itself. The visitors therefore require the practice portfolio and the supporting documents for placements to be submitted in order to ensure that this standard is being met.

**5.7.3 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the expectations of professional conduct.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit documentation to ensure that this Standard of Education and Training is being met.

**Reason:** During the course of the visit it became clear that the education provider had updated its programme documentation prior to the visit but that these documents had not been supplied to the visitors ahead of the visit. In particular, it was noted that the Practice Portfolio had not been supplied. Though the updated documentation was supplied during the course of the visit, the visitors were unable to adequately scrutinise the revised documentation within the context of the visit itself. The visitors therefore require the practice portfolio and the supporting documents for placements to be submitted in order to ensure that this standard is being met.

**5.7.4 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure.**



**Condition:** The education provider must submit documentation to ensure that this Standard of Education and Training is being met.

**Reason:** During the course of the visit it became clear that the education provider had updated its programme documentation prior to the visit but that these documents had not been supplied to the visitors ahead of the visit. In particular, it was noted that the Practice Portfolio had not been supplied. Though the updated documentation was supplied during the course of the visit, the visitors were unable to adequately scrutinise the revised documentation within the context of the visit itself. The visitors therefore require the practice portfolio and the supporting documents for placements to be submitted in order to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence on how they assure themselves that mentors have relevant qualifications and experience for ambulance placements on the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted prior to the visit the visitors judged that the system for the education provider to assure themselves that practice placement educators had relevant qualifications and experience was not clearly articulated. Subsequent discussions with the programme team clarified the situation, however, the visitors wished to see documentary evidence on how this standard was being met.

#### **5.8.2 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators must be appropriately registered.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence on how they assure themselves that mentors for ambulance placements are appropriately registered.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted prior to the visit the visitors judged that the system for the education provider to assure themselves that practice placement educators were appropriately registered was not clearly articulated. Subsequent discussions with the programme team clarified the situation, however, the visitors wished to see documentary evidence on how this standard was being met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence on how they assure themselves that mentors undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors judged that the system for the education provider to assure itself that mentors undertook appropriate practice placement educator training was not clearly articulated. During discussions with the programme team it was mentioned that there was a five year plan in place to train mentors. The visitors require further evidence,

including the policy for mentors and their training, for ambulance placements to ensure that this standard is being met.

**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 submit revised placement documentation to ensure that this Standard of Education and Training is being met.

**Reason:** During the course of the visit it became clear that the education provider had updated its programme documentation prior to the visit but that these documents had not been supplied to the visitors ahead of the visit. In particular, it was noted that the Practice Portfolio had not been supplied. Though the updated documentation was supplied during the course of the visit, the visitors were unable to adequately scrutinise the revised documentation within the context of the visit itself. The visitors therefore require the practice portfolio and the supporting documents for placements to be submitted in order to ensure that this standard is being met on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must supply updated grade criteria that covers both the academic and practice placement components and clearly state the overall pass mark for the programme.

**Reason:** In the documentation supplied prior to the visit conflicting grade descriptors were present for the grade of D- covering both the academic and practice placement components of the course, both of which contributed to the students' final pass mark. During the course of the visit it was stated that the education provider had updated its programme documentation prior to the visit but the updated documents had not been circulated to the visitors. From the documentation provided the visitors were concerned that the grade criteria suggested that a student could complete the programme and not be fit to practice. Therefore, on the basis of the information provided, the visitors could not assess whether this standard was being met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must submit revised placement documentation to ensure that this Standard of Education and Training is being met.

**Reason:** During the course of the visit it became clear that the education provider had updated its programme documentation prior to the visit but that these documents had not been supplied to the visitors ahead of the visit. In particular, it was noted that the Practice Portfolio had not been supplied. Though the updated documentation was supplied during the course of the visit, the visitors were unable to adequately scrutinise the revised documentation within

the context of the visit itself. The visitors therefore require the practice portfolio and the supporting documents for placements to be submitted in order to ensure that the Standards of Proficiency are being assessed and met on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence regarding OSCE assessments to ensure that this Standard of Education and Training is being met.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not determine the details regarding OSCE assessments within the programme. Discussions with students at the visit provided further information regarding the OSCEs that was not contained in the programme documentation provided. Therefore, the visitors requested that revised evidence should be submitted, including information on the OSCE assessments within the programme, the process behind critical fails and an example of an OSCE sheet to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate the process in place for the moderation of practice placement assessments, to ensure parity in assessments for students on practice placement.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted prior to the visit it was unclear what processes were in place to ensure that practice placement grades were moderated. In discussion with the programme team it was noted that grades were assigned to placements by mentors and these helped to contribute to students final pass marks. It was also mentioned that placement grades were only moderated if there was a fail grade. The visitors request further documentation that clearly articulates the moderation procedures in place.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must submit revised placement documentation to ensure that this Standard of Education and Training is being met.

**Reason:** During the course of the visit it became clear that the education provider had updated its programme documentation prior to the visit but that these documents had not been supplied to the visitors ahead of the visit. In particular, it was noted that the Practice Portfolio had not been supplied. Though the updated documentation was supplied during the course of the visit, the visitors were unable to adequately scrutinise the revised documentation within the context of the visit itself. The visitors therefore require the practice portfolio and the supporting documents for placements to be submitted in order to ensure that there are effective mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in assessments.

## **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 submit revised placement documentation to ensure that this Standard of Education and Training is being met.

**Reason:** During the course of the visit it became clear that the education provider had updated its programme documentation prior to the visit but that these documents had not been supplied to the visitors ahead of the visit. In particular, it was noted that the Practice Portfolio had not been supplied. Though the updated documentation was supplied during the course of the visit, the visitors were unable to adequately scrutinise the revised documentation within the context of the visit itself. The visitors therefore require the practice portfolio and the supporting documents for placements to be submitted in order to ensure that professional aspects of practice are being assessed on the programme.

### **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 revisit the documentation and include a statement to clearly articulate that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility to apply for registration.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted, there was no statement to clarify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility to apply for admission onto the HPC Register. Therefore, the visitors requested that the education provider include a statement to this effect.

### **6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of its policies and procedures relating to the appointment of external examiners to the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied from discussions with programme team that the system and procedures for appointing external examiners was in place. However, the documentation submitted prior to the visit did not clearly articulate these procedures, and specifically, it did not articulate how the education provider meets this standard by appointing at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors require evidence within the programme documentation of the external examiner policy for the programme.

Vincent Clarke  
Graham Harris

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Central Lancashire
<b>Programme name</b>	DipHE Paramedic Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full and Part Time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of visit</b>	29–30 January 2009

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction .....	3
<b>Visit details .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome .....	6
<b>Conditions .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Recommendation .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Commendation.....</b>	<b>10</b>

## **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 'Paramedic' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 6 April 2009 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 11 June 2009. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 6 April 2009. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 11 June 2009.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

**Visit details**

Name of HPC visitors and profession	David Whitmore (Paramedic) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HPC executive officers (in attendance)	Paula Lescott Anne Shomefun
Proposed student numbers	40
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2009
Chair	John Holloway (University of Central Lancashire)
Secretary	Liz Edwards (University of Central Lancashire)
Members of the joint panel	Alan Rice (St George's, University of London) Jeanie Judge (University of Central Lancashire) Cath Toase (University of Central Lancashire) Julie Pierce Jones (University of Central Lancashire)



## Sources of evidence

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

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

The HPC did not review External examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as the documentation does not exist.

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

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

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 SETs.

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

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

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

## Conditions

### **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 education provider must review the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme to follow the guidance provided in the HPC “Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers”.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted by the education provider it was clear that the documentation did not fully comply with the advertising protocol issued by HPC. In particular, the HPC is not a professional body or an accrediting body and should not be referred to as such in any materials related to an HPC approved programme. There are also instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to the registered status of individuals such as “state registered”. It should also be made clear throughout all of the documentation that completion of the programme provides eligibility to apply for HPC registration.

The visitors considered that the terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the documentation (including website information) to be thoroughly reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology.

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

**Condition:** The educational provider must provide documentary confirmation of the number of additional staffing in terms of clinical/tutorial staff seconded from the North West Ambulance Service.

**Reason:** During the visit the education provider mentioned that more North West Ambulance Service clinical/tutorial staff would be developed to support the programme. Once these plans are finalised after the meeting with the local Strategic Health Authority in February 2009 the visitors require documentary confirmation of the number of additional staffing seconded from the North West Ambulance Service. This information is needed, so as to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

**Condition:** The educational provider must provide documentary confirmation of the type of additional staffing in terms of clinical/tutorial staff seconded from the North West Ambulance Service.

**Reason:** It was apparent from documentation submitted before the visit that 2 out of the 19 members of the programme staff team were paramedics. During the visit the education provider mentioned that more North West Ambulance Service

clinical/tutorial staff would be developed to support the programme. Once these plans are finalised after the meeting with the local Strategic Health Authority in February 2009 the visitors require documentary confirmation of the type of additional staffing seconded from the North West Ambulance Service. This information is needed, so as to ensure that this standard is being met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must submit documentation which illustrates a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

**Reason:** From the discussions with the programme team it was clear that the education provider utilises a multi-professional audit tool and that this is in the process of being reviewed. The visitors did not receive a copy of the finalised version of this tool and to ensure there is a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements, the visitors would like to receive a copy of the finalised document.

**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 current and planned number of qualified mentors and details of the region that they will cover.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted prior to the visit the visitors found it difficult to determine the number of mentors currently trained to supervise students during placements. During discussions with the programme and senior team, the visitors learnt that the education provider plans to train more mentors in those regions which currently have limited numbers of mentors. The visitors therefore require documentary confirmation of the current number of trained mentors and the planned number of mentors that will be trained, with details of the regions they will cover. The confirmation is needed so as to ensure that this standard is met.

**6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed.**

**Condition:** The education provider must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners must be registered unless alternative arrangements have been agreed with HPC.

**Reason:** The submitted documentation did not contain HPC requirements regarding external examiner recruitment. The visitors, therefore, felt that this needs to be included within the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of these requirements.

## Recommendation

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

**Condition:** The visitors wish to encourage that the education provider maintains the Year 2 students status as guaranteed clinical supervision as much as is possible on practice placements.

**Reason:** At the visit the educational provider mentioned that in Year 2 students would be on guaranteed clinical supervision while on placement. The visitors would wish to support this approach with a view to encouraging, wherever possible, that Year 2 students remain on guaranteed clinical supervision while on placement in order to further benefit student learning.

## Commendation

**Commendation:** The visitors commended the student competence passport for placements developed by the education provider for its innovative concept, process and application.

**Reason:** During the visit the programme team provided the visitors with further placement documentation. The visitors were informed that the student competence passport, designed as an aide for both students and placement staff, set out clearly in a tabulation what students were expected to do on placements at a specific point in time. The student competence passport was, therefore, commended as best practice.

David Whitmore  
Glyn Harding