

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme name</b>	Independent and supplementary prescribing: prescribing in practice - Allied Health Professions
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Radiographers Physiotherapists Chiropodists/Podiatrists
<b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Date of visit</b>	14 December 2010

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Commendations.....	7

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 16 February 2011. At the Committee meeting on 16 February 2011, the programme was approved. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

## Introduction

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

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

Name of HPC visitor and profession	James Pickard (Podiatrist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	
Proposed start date of programme approval	April 2011
Chair	Rosalynd Jowett (University of Southampton)
Secretary	Sara Dixon (University of Southampton)
Members of the joint panel	Neil Smyth (Internal Panel Member) Kerry Clarke (External Panel Member)

## Sources of evidence

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

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

The HPC did not review a SOPs mapping prior to the visit as a mapping document was not required by the visitor as the programme is a post-registration qualification.

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 Nurse Supplementary Prescribing Programme and one physiotherapy student who had completed the pharmacology unit, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitor 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 (SOP) for this entitlement.

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

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for 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 visitor 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 visitor has also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must include the application form for this programme in all relevant documentation, to demonstrate all admissions criteria to be met, and to give an applicant the information they require to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit did not include the application form that applicants complete to apply for a place on the programme. During the meeting with the programme team, the application form was presented to the panel. The visitor and the team discussed its relevance, including how the Criminal Records Bureau and Health checks were made prior to admission to the programme, especially in relation to allied health professionals (AHPs) applying to the programme.

As this document had not been included in the documentation received prior to the visit, the visitor would like to receive revised documentation that includes the application form as it applies to AHPs making an application to the programme, to ensure that those applying to the programme have the required information to make an informed choice about whether to take up the offer of a place on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide programme documentation that includes the audit tool for maintaining and approving an effective system for approving and monitoring practice placements.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the documentation including the SETs mapping document indicated monitoring of placements was not applicable. However in the meeting with the programme team it was discussed that there was a robust system of approving and monitoring placements in place for the programme. The programme leader provided a copy of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement.

As this audit tool was not included in the documentation received by the visitor prior to the visit, the visitor would like to receive revised programme documentation which includes this audit tool to demonstrate how practice placements are approved and monitored in relation to this programme to ensure that the audit tool is thorough and effective as an audit mechanism.

## Commendations

The visitor wishes to commend the following aspects of the programme:

**Commendation:** The final examination taken by the students after they have completed their portfolio and work with the designated medical practitioner.

**Reason:** The visitor considered this to be an example of best practice as it shows the education provider is taking responsibility for the final assessment of the student as well as considering the work in the portfolio assessed by the designated medical practitioner. This was the first time that the visitor had seen a final examination within a Supplementary Prescribing programme. Usually the education provider relies on the judgment of the designated medical practitioner within the practice placement handbook. The visitor considered this to be a valuable asset to this programme and the visitor saw it as innovative.

Information about this can be found by contacting the Faculty of Health Sciences at the University of Southampton.

James Pickard