hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Bangor University
Programme name	Non-Medical / Independent Prescribing (V300)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Chiropodist / podiatrist Physiotherapist Radiographer
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Date of visit	15 January 2013

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title Chiropodist / Podiatrist, Physiotherapist or Radiographer must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 HCPC 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. The education provider has until 25 February 2013 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 27 March 2013. 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 February 2013. 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 27 March 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC 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 an HCPC only visit. The education provider and validating did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic) Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Matthew Nelson
Proposed student numbers	30
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	David Wright (Bangor University)
Secretary	Gemma Plowman (Bangor University)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with nursing and pharmacy students, as the programme is seeking approval by the HCPC and therefore does not currently have any chiropody / podiatry, physiotherapy or radiography 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 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 visitors have also made one recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors noted the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the relevant guidance issued by HCPC. There were a number of instances across the documentation where the programme's learning outcomes were mapped to 'HCPC outcomes' (Appendix 3b; HCPC learning outcomes mapping; module handbook, p20; DMP handbook, p19 and the student portfolio). The programme team indicated that these outcomes had been taken from The Department of Health's 'Outline Curriculum for Training Programmes to prepare Allied Health Professionals as Supplementary Prescribers'. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that these outcomes covered the HCPC's singular standard of proficiency relevant to supplementary prescribing (within SOP 2.4b), they noted that the term 'HCPC outcome' is not a term used by the HCPC. Programme learning outcomes must instead be mapped to the singular relevant standard of proficiency. The visitors require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instances of incorrect terminology. In this way the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available to support students' learning are being effectively used and that this standard can be met.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that while there was a section on professional unsuitability, there was no reference to HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Further discussion with the programme team revealed that these standards (along with equivalent codes of conduct from other regulators) had being considered whilst assembling the examples of professional unsuitability. Although students on the programme will be existing HCPC registrants who agree to adhere to the HCPC standards of conduct performance and ethics as part of the registration and renewal processes, they will have to consider the standards under the new scope of a supplementary prescriber. Whilst the visitors felt that the elements of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics may be covered, they require additional evidence to identify precisely where the programme team covers the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance within the programme. By doing so the visitors can be assured that students on the programme understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics, including how and when they apply.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider that if the programme recruits students beyond the 30 funded places stated, the staffing levels for the programme are reviewed appropriately.

Reason: The visitors were content that this standard was met. However, the documentation and discussions with the programme team indicated that on top of the 30 funded places on offer to applicants to the programme, they would also consider recruiting self-funded students to a total maximum number that resources will allow. This maximum number was undefined. If the programme does recruit beyond the 30 funded places, the visitors would like the education provider to consider reviewing the staff numbers for the programme to ensure there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Gwyn Thomas
Paul Blakeman

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Birmingham City University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	29 – 30 January 2013

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 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 HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 20 March 2013 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 9 May 2013. 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 15 April 2013. 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 4 July 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC 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 HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Vince Clarke (Paramedic)
	Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
HCPC observer	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Derek Cassidy (Birmingham City University)
Secretary	Jane Binks (Birmingham City University)
Members of the joint panel	Kevin Barrett (External Panel Member)
	Enid Egginton (Internal Panel Member)
	Barbara Nugent (Internal Panel Member)
	Mary Rooke (Internal Panel Member)
	Mark Stanley (External Panel Member)
	Sally Thompson (External Panel Member)
	Laura Tomlinson (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit, the programme is a new programme and therefore no reports exist.

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students and graduates from the Dip HE Paramedic Science 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 51 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 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.

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 submit planned advertising materials for the programme which includes information about any additional entry tests.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included website links to the existing Dip HE Paramedic Science programme to show how the advertising materials would be presented. The visitors noted the programme specification document referred to a fitness test for applicants to undertake, "Students must be physically fit and have the strength to lift and carry patients and equipment. This will be tested at the selection event during the fitness test" (page 8). Through discussion with the programme team it was clarified the 'fitness test' is to be a 'dexterity test'. The visitors wish to ensure that potential applicants are given full information about the programme and to ensure that the nature of any additional entry tests is clear. The visitors are aware this programme has a planned commencement date of September 2014 and therefore finalised advertising materials may not be available yet. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit planned advertising materials for the programme which includes information about any additional entry tests.

2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards.

Condition: The education provider must submit further information to clarify the non-direct entry route for the programme and information to demonstrate how potential applicants are clearly informed of the requirements for the non-direct entry route to the programme.

Reason: The documentation provided for this visit included the programme specification document which had details about the entry routes onto the programme. It detailed a direct entry route and a non-direct entry route. The visitors were satisfied the direct entry route to the programme was appropriate. The visitors noted the non-direct entry route stated applicants will need:
- to be employed in a trainee paramedic role;
- to have support of line manager and their organisation;
- to have access to a mentor who has completed Birmingham City University's mentor training;
- to hold an IHCD Ambulance Technician Award;
- to hold a QAA approved Access to HE Diploma in a Health subject (must include Mathematics and English Language GCSE equivalent if not already achieved); and
- to undertake and pass Organisation / Trust entrance interviews and examinations (Programme specification, page 9).

The visitors were concerned this list of entry requirements could require a lot more effort than the direct entry route and so could disadvantage potential applicants who would be more suited to a non-direct entry route onto the programme. In discussion with the programme team it was indicated the list provided was not intended in the way the programme specification reads. It was also highlighted the applicants for this programme via the non-direct entry route would be assessed on an individual basis.

From this evidence the visitors could not determine what the non-direct entry route requirements were and how potential applicants were informed of this route. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further information to clarify the non-direct entry route for the programme and information to demonstrate how potential applicants are clearly informed of the requirements for the non-direct entry route to the programme.

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must submit further information surrounding the routes onto the programme and evidence to demonstrate this information is clear for applicants.

Reason: The documentation provided for this visit included information about the education provider wide accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) processes (Appendix 6). The programme specification document indicates that applicants can apply to use the AP(E)L process, "Claims by students who wish to apply for APEL must be approved by the Personal Development Department on an individual basis" (page 8). It was highlighted through discussion that it would be difficult for applicants to transfer onto this programme through the AP(E)L route due to the professional nature of the programme. The programme specification document also had details about the non-direct entry route onto the programme. Through discussions with the programme team it was clarified that applicants to the programme through the non-direct entry route would be looked at on an individual basis. The visitors considered it to be confusing that the non-direct entry route was considered in a similar way to the AP(E)L process. From discussions the visitors were unable to determine the routes onto the programme, particularly whether the non-direct entry route to the programme was part of the AP(E)L process or whether the AP(E)L process was an alternative way to enter the programme. The visitors also considered this may be confusing to applicants for the programme. The visitors therefore require further information surrounding the routes onto the programme and evidence to demonstrate this information is clear for applicants.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate what commitment is being made with the placement providers to ensure the practice placements for students will be secure for the duration of their study.

Reason: The documentation indicates the education provider has existing relationships with placement providers through delivering an existing programme. The visitors noted this new programme may have different requirements of the placement providers than the existing programme. In discussions it was articulated an agreement would be made with all parties offering placements. These agreements would look to guarantee a number of placements for specified periods of time to ensure the placements are secure for all students across the duration of the programme. It was highlighted the education providers admissions processes required the programme to be able to guarantee placements for a student for the duration of the programme before being able to admit them onto the programme. The visitors noted it may be difficult for placements to guarantee places for the entire duration of the programme as the workforce landscape changes. The visitors considered this could be a particular problem for private placement providers as their work depends on the contracts they receive. The visitors

have not seen evidence of initial discussions or final arrangements in place to guarantee placements with the placement providers for this new programme. In order to determine this standard is met visitors require evidence of these arrangements to see what commitment is being made with the placement providers to ensure the practice placements for students on the programme will be secure for the duration of their study.

3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation to ensure references to the HCPC's standards and requirements for registration are accurate.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit contained occurrences of misleading information. The visitors noted the programme handbook referenced continuous professional development inaccurately. "Continuous Professional Development (CPD) which is a requirement of the HCPC every 2 years" (page 26). The visitors highlighted that CPD is a requirement of registrants to stay registered with the HCPC, it is something that should be continually undertaken. Every two years the HCPC will randomly select a percentage of people from that profession and require them to submit their CPD profiles for audit. The visitors additionally noted an incorrect reference to HCPC standards, "All clinical staff adhere to their responsibilities as laid down in their Codes of Professional Conduct" (page 19). The visitors highlighted that the HCPC does not have codes of conduct; the HCPC has the standards of conduct, performance and ethics and standards of proficiency registrants must adhere to. The visitors considered the documentation to be misleading to students and therefore require the programme documentation to be reviewed to ensure references to the HCPC's standards and requirements for registration are accurate.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
  - **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
  - **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
  - **expectations of professional conduct;**
  - **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
  - **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The programme documentation must be revised to ensure the programme expectations for the number of practice placement hours the student must undertake and the HCPC's position regarding placement hours is clarified

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit provided information for the students and practice placement educators about practice placements. The programme course guide states that "The College of Paramedics curriculum guidance recommends students attend a total of 2250 hours in practice over a 3 year programme. This should be split into 750 hours per year in order to be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. There is an expectation that student paramedics will aim for 100% attendance in both University and practice settings"(page 24). The visitors noted the programme handbook includes a diagram of the programme that maps modules and placements against the years (pages 12-14). The visitors noted from this mapping, the required 750

hours per year could be completed early on in the year if the shift arrangements with the practice placements allowed this. The visitors considered with the 750 hours specifically stated, students may feel they do not need to complete the rest of the placement hours for the year if they have completed the required 750 hours. Through discussion with the programme team it was indicated the programme structure is designed to allow for additional time, enabling students to consolidate skills and practice or make up hours and placement experience as required. All practice placements are expected to be completed within the programme. The visitors were satisfied with this explanation however require the programme documentation to make it clear that the programme expectations are separate and different from the professional body requirements. The visitors also noted the statement above implies the HCPC has a requirement for a specific number of practice hours to be attended in order to be eligible to apply for registration. This is incorrect in that the HCPC has no attendance requirements for students to adhere to. The visitors also require the documentation to be revisited to ensure that there are no confusions regarding HCPC requirements for practice hours attendance. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to ensure the programme expectations for the number of practice placement hours the student must undertake and the HCPC's position regarding placement hours is clarified.

Recommendations

2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider consider that applicants and students may find it useful to know their employability prospects if they have not gained the particular driving requirements that working in the profession may require.

Reason: The visitors noted the programme admission procedures do not require applicants to hold a driving licence for admission to the programme. The visitors are aware that driving an ambulance can be a key part of the job role for paramedics. Discussions with the programme team indicated they would make this clear for students during the latter stages of the programme. The visitors suggest this information may be better provided at the beginning stages of the programme – including before application to the programme, so that applicants and students are fully aware from the outset of the impact this may have on their future employability prospects.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider ensure they regularly review any changes to the programmes being delivered or the cohort numbers and inform the HCPC of any changes to programme delivery and cohort numbers through our major change process if necessary.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the plans for delivering this programme. The faculty currently delivers an HCPC approved programme - Dip HE Paramedic Science. The education provider is planning to move completely to this new BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science programme and commence the programme in September 2014. The maximum cohort number for this new programme is the same number as it is for the existing programme. The visitors feel that in the continually changing workforce landscape it may be that the education provider decides they need to deliver both programmes at once. The visitors recommend the education provider review any changes to the programmes being delivered or changes to cohort numbers to ensure the staff resources remain appropriate for both programme's needs. The visitors also note that if necessary the education provider may need to inform the HCPC of any changes to programme delivery and cohort numbers through our major change process.

3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider look to ensure consistency and clarity within the module descriptors.

Reason: In the documentation provided the visitors noted the module descriptors could be confusing for students. The visitors noted that different modules referred to the same textbook but listed different editions. They noted some textbooks had publishing dates which were incorrect and inconsistent in different modules. They noted there were abbreviations throughout the module descriptors with no explanations as to what they

meant. The visitors thought this might be confusing for students referring to the module descriptors and so recommend the programme team look to ensure consistency and clarity within the descriptors.

Vince Clarke
Mark Nevins

![hcpc health & care professions council]

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Liverpool John Moores University
Programme name	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	22 – 23 January 2013

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 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 HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 4 March 2013 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 27 March 2013. 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 8 April 2013. 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 June 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum and practice placements. The programme was already approved by the HCPC 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 reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Bob Fellows (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
HCPC observer	Angela Scarlett-Newcomen
Proposed student numbers	41 per cohort
First approved intake	September 2009
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Tony Hall (Liverpool John Moores University)
Secretary	Jagori Banerjee (Liverpool John Moores University)
Members of the joint panel	Linda Barton (Internal Panel member) Judith Carrier (External Panel member) Ewan Armitage (College of Paramedics) Graham Harris (College of Paramedics)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

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 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 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.

Conditions

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must submit the finalised practice placement documentation and evidence to demonstrate how the programme team intend to roll this new documentation out to all students and practice mentors across the North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust (NWAST).

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included practice placement assessment documents and practice placement skills logs. The documentation submitted was in draft form. The placements for this programme are shared with two other education providers in the area; this has led to collaboration between the three education providers and the placement providers. Discussion with the placement providers and the programme team indicated further work was needed to agree the documents between the three education providers and the placement providers to finalise them. The visitors are also aware the new documentation is different to the documents already used for placements and so further work will need to be undertaken by the programme team to disseminate the new documents to enable students and practice mentors to be able to use it. Discussion with the programme team indicated they were considering this but no plans had yet been determined. The visitors require the finalised practice placement documentation to ensure it provides appropriate information for students and practice mentors. The visitors also require the programme team to submit further evidence to demonstrate how they intend to roll out this new documentation across the placements and ensure the students and practice mentors are able to use the new documentation (evidence such as action plans, training plans, meeting minutes to indicate discussions between placements and the programme team could be used).

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must submit the finalised module descriptors and the finalised practice placement documentation.

Reason: The practice placement documentation and the module descriptors submitted prior to the visit were in draft format. Discussions at the visit indicated the module descriptors may undergo some amendments and the practice placement documentation would be undergoing changes before it would all be finalised. The practice placement documentation has the standards of proficiency for paramedics built into it as skills for the student to achieve and be assessed on. Discussion at the visit indicated the module descriptor changes were changes to the assessments of the modules. The visitors need

to ensure the changes to the assessments and the placement documentation do not have an adverse effect on how the programme assesses the students' ability to meet the standards of proficiency upon successfully completing the programme. The visitors therefore require the finalised practice placement documentation and the finalised module descriptors for the programme.

Recommendations

2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards.

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend the education provider revisit the programme admissions materials to ensure all driving requirements for applicants are included within advertising materials and information provided.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied the admissions procedures applied appropriate academic and professional entry standards. The information received about the programme before and during the visit indicated the programme has certain driving requirements for entry to the programme. At the point of entry, the student must have a driving licence and must also have a higher category of C1 added to their driving licence. Through discussions it was clarified this requirement meant that by the point of entry to the programme the student must have a driving licence and the category of C1, this could mean that applicants could apply for the programme without a licence but intend to procure one before commencing the programme. The visitors felt the advertising materials and information about UCAS entry did not state this explicitly. The visitors recommend the programme team revisit the admissions materials and clarify this information.

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend the education provider inform the HCPC if they decide to implement an exit or step-off award for this programme.

Reason: The information received about the programme indicated there were no step-off or exit awards in place for this programme. At the visit, the visiting panel discussed with the programme team the opportunity for the programme to make use of an exit or step-off award for those students who are unable to fully complete the programme. This would enable them to be conferred with an award that recognises the work they have done without them being eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. The programme team decided to consider this further outside of the visit. The visitors recommend the programme team inform the HCPC if they do decide at a later stage to implement an exit or step-off award to ensure this standard continues to be met.

Paul Bates
Bob Fellows

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of visit	15 – 17 January 2013

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Operating department practioner' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 5 March 2013 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 27 March 2013. 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 22 April 2013. 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 4 July 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC 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 – DipHE Operating Department Practice, MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) and Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
	Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
HCPC observer	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort once per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Will Diver (University of Plymouth)
Secretary	Jo Melhuish (University of Plymouth)
	Kahila Smith (University of Plymouth)
	Cirstie Rennie (University of Plymouth)
	Claire Ellis (University of Plymouth)
Members of the joint panel	Lloyd Howell (College of Operating Department Practice)
	Mike Donnellon (External Panel member)
	Beth Gompertz (Internal Panel member)
	Val Heath (Internal Panel member)
	Mel Joyner (Internal Panel member)
	Sharon Wilkinson (Internal Panel member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit, this programme is a new programme and therefore this documentation does not exist.

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the DipHE Operating Department Practice, 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 46 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 11 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 for the programme.

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

Conditions

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 revisit the advertising materials for the programme to ensure they are providing all the information potential applicants require for them to make an informed choice about the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the online information and the advertising leaflet for the programme. They noted there was some information not included that they considered important for applicants to be able to make informed choices about the programme. This information included details about the award to be gained and mandatory admissions procedures (the occupational health check and enhanced CRB check). In order that the programme meets this standard the visitors require the education provider to revisit the advertising materials to ensure this information is included.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit information that confirms whether this programme will be commissioned to run or not for the planned September 2013 commencement date.

Reason: At the time of the visit the programme was yet to receive confirmation this programme would be commissioned to run. Discussion at the visit indicated if this programme was commissioned then the DipHE Operating Department Practice programme would close and be replaced with this programme. It was confirmed that the number of students was anticipated to be the same for both programmes. It was also confirmed that arrangements have been made so only one of the programmes would be running at the same time. The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates whether the programme will be commissioned to run or not for the planned September 2013 commencement date to be able to ensure this programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must submit information that includes details of how the programme team intend to effectively manage the practice placements in regards to module the ODP 302 Surgical First Assistant.

Reason: The visitors noted the ODP 302 Surgical First Assistant module included techniques for the students to undertake which were not included in the existing DipHE Operating Department Practice programme. The module expects students to be able to undertake advanced clinical skills in line with the role of Surgical First Assistant. The visitors are aware that the advanced skills the students need to undertake can be problematic for the placement providers to be able to provide a suitably experienced person to work with the student undertaking the skillset the module requires. Discussion indicated the programme team had begun talking about this with the practice placements to ensure that the experience could be gained, however there was no firm outcomes from any discussions and the visitors were unable to determine that the

module was fully supported by the placement providers. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team intends to work with the placement providers to effectively manage the practice placements in regards to module the ODP 302 Surgical First Assistant.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit information that includes details of the module leaders for this programme.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included programme team staff CV's and descriptions of the modules. The documentation did not have details of who would be the module leaders. Discussion at the visit indicated that if the programme gained commissioning, resources to recruit additional staff would be in place. Additionally they had already considered the module leads but not included details as they may change as more staff was recruited. The visitors were therefore unable to determine that subject areas would be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. In order to determine this standard is met the visitors require information that demonstrates the indicative module leaders and where new staff may be used.

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

Condition: The education provider must amend programme documentation to remove references to the HCPC having a statutory attendance requirement for students.

Reason: Within the documentation provided there were references to the HCPC having statutory attendance requirements. "This is to ensure compliance with the statutory attendance requirements of the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC)" (Practice Competency Assessment BSc (Hons) year 1, P11). The HCPC enforces no statutory requirements for attendance of students for academic learning or practice placement learning. The visitors require these references to be amended throughout the documentation. The visitors also noted other inaccuracies through the documentation which need to be corrected. For example, in the programme handbook p39, there is a reference to appendix 3 for module descriptors however appendix 3 is the end of placement feedback form and on p61 there is a reference to appendix 2 which is also incorrect. The visitors require all inaccuracies and incorrect references to be corrected within the documentation.

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 finalised descriptions of the modules for this programme.

Reason: During the visit discussion indicated revisions would be made to the module descriptors concerning some learning outcomes and general amendments. The visitors will need to determine the learning outcomes of the revised module descriptors will ensure those who successfully complete the programme will meet the standards of

proficiency for their part of the Register. Therefore the visitors require the education provider submit revised module descriptors for review.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate they have immediate access to details regarding the mentors working with students from this programme.

Reason: Documentation provided for this visit stated "a 'live' mentor database is kept of all staff that mentor ODP students" (SETs mapping document, SET 5.6). At the visit the visitors viewed the database and were informed it was a voluntary database into which information was populated by members from the individual practice placement areas. The visitors were concerned this could mean it was difficult for the programme team to be able to know who was working with their students at any given time and to be able to ensure those mentors were appropriately qualified and experienced. Upon raising this concern with the programme team it was stated the information collected from the placements audits included details about the mentors and this was inputted onto the system, it was also described that individual placement areas maintained lists of where students were placed and the programme team could ask for access to these lists. The visitors were satisfied the information was available however were concerned the programme team did not have direct access to information about who students were located with. The visitors additionally have not seen the evidence that the information collected through the audit process is being inputted onto a system accessible to the programme team. The visitors therefore require evidence that the programme team have immediate access to information regarding who their students are working with at any time and information to be able to ensure that those mentors were appropriately qualified and experienced.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate they have immediate access to details regarding the training undertaken by mentors working with students from this programme.

Reason: Documentation provided for this visit stated "a 'live' mentor database is kept of all staff that mentor ODP students" (SETs mapping document, SET 5.6). At the visit the visitors viewed the database and were informed it was a voluntary database into which information was populated by members from the individual practice placement areas. The visitors were concerned this could mean it was difficult for the programme team to be able to know who was working with their students at any given time and to be able to ensure those mentors had been appropriately trained. Upon raising this concern with the programme team it was stated the information collected from the placement audits included these details about the mentors and this was inputted onto their system. The visitors were satisfied the information was available from the audits however have not seen the evidence that the information collected through the audit process is being inputted onto a system accessible to the programme team. The visitors therefore require evidence the programme team have immediate access to information regarding who their students are working with at any given time and are able to ensure those mentors are appropriately trained.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must submit the practice placement documentation for levels 5 and 6 (years 2 and 3) of the programme.

Reason: With the documentation submitted prior to the visit the education provider included some of the practice placement documentation for level 4, however did not provide the documentation for levels 5 and 6 of the programme. In order to determine the education provider is providing all the information that students and practice mentors need in order to be fully prepared for placement the visitors require the education provider to submit this documentation.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must submit further information that demonstrates how the programme team intends to work with placement providers to ensure the practice mentors are fully prepared for the placement that corresponds to module ODP 302 Surgical First Assistant, including ensuring appropriate support is provided for practice mentors and ensuring parity of placement experience for students.

Reason: The visitors noted the ODP 302 Surgical First Assistant module included techniques for the students to undertake which were not included in the existing DipHE Operating Department Practice programme. The module expects students to be able to undertake advanced clinical skills in line with the role of Surgical First Assistant. The visitors are aware that the advanced skills the students need to undertake can be problematic for the placement providers to be able to provide a suitably experienced person to work with the student undertaking the skillset the module requires. The visitors were also aware that work would need to be undertaken to ensure the practice mentors were fully supported in undertaking this module with students and to ensure that all students were receiving the same experience through their practice placements to be able to meet the requirements of the module. Discussion indicated work would be undertaken to ensure the practice mentors would be suitably prepared for this role and

supported in undertaking this however no details of how this would be carried out were provided. The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates how the education provider intends to ensure that the practice mentors are fully prepared to work with students undertaking this module.

5.13 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the rights and needs of service users are respected throughout practice placement.

Reason: The visitors noted the ODP 302 Surgical First Assistant module included techniques for the students to undertake which were not included in the existing DipHE Operating Department Practice programme. The module expects students to be able to undertake advanced clinical skills in line with the role of Surgical First Assistant. The visitors are aware that service user consent to be treated by a student is taken as part of the students practice learning and through adherence to the professional body Student Standards of Professional Behaviour. When looking at this module in particular the visitors need reassurance that service users are being fully informed that they will be treated by a student.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must submit finalised descriptions of the modules for this programme.

Reason: During the visit discussion indicated revisions would be made to the module descriptors concerning some learning outcomes and general amendments. The visitors will need to determine the assessment of the learning outcomes in the revised module descriptors will ensure those who successfully complete the programme will meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. Therefore the visitors require the education provider submit revised module descriptors for review.

Recommendations

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Recommendation: When the education provider's appointed external examiner reaches the end of their term, the HCPC may need to be informed through the major change process.

Reason: Through the documentation the visitors noted it was anticipated the external examiner for the existing DipHE Operating Department Practice programme would also become the external examiner for this programme. The visitors additionally noted this person would be due to reach the end of their term in this position in the next year or so. The visitors wished the education provider to note that the programme must have at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the register and if the new person to take up this role was not from the relevant part of the Register, the HCPC would need to be informed through the major change process.

Penny Joyce
Tony Scripps

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	15 – 17 January 2013

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 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 HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 4 March 2013 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 27 March 2013. 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 22 April 2013. 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 4 July 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC 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) Operating Department Practice, DipHE Operating Department Practice and Post graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational therapist)
	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	12 per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Will Diver (University of Plymouth)
Secretary	Jo Melhuish (University of Plymouth)
	Kahila Smith (University of Plymouth)
	Cirstie Rennie (University of Plymouth)
	Claire Ellis (University of Plymouth)
Members of the joint panel	Clair Parkin (College of Occupational Therapy)
	Chris McKenna (College of Occupational Therapy)
	Christine Craik (College of Occupational Therapy)
	Claire Brewis (External Panel member)
	Beth Gompertz (Internal Panel member)
	Val Heath (Internal Panel member)
	Mel Joyner (Internal Panel member)
	Sharon Wilkinson (Internal Panel member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, 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 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The education provider must implement formal protocols to obtain informed consent for when students participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided, through discussion with the students and during the meeting with programme team, that there were no formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical and clinical teaching. During discussion with the students it was clear that informed consent was not obtained, although the students felt they could opt-out from participating with no impact on their learning. The visitors noted the programme used a range of teaching methods including role plays, practising techniques with equipment for the profession. The visitors were concerned that without consent protocols in place there would be nothing to mitigate any risk involved in students participating as service users. The visitors could not determine how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained or how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors have noted the other programmes being reviewed at this visit used consent procedures which could be adapted for this programme. The visitors therefore require evidence that the programme team implement formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme or annually) and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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

Condition: The education provider must identify where on the programme students' attendance is mandatory and how the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

Reason: The visitors noted that, in the documentation provided, there was no explicit reference to where and when attendance is mandatory for students on the programme. In discussion with the students it was highlighted that there is an attendance policy and that students are aware of when attendance is mandatory. The visitors also discussed the attendance policy with the programme team who highlighted that an attendance policy for this programmes was available. However, the visitors were unsure how students starting the programme would be informed of the attendance policy, how it would be enforced and what, if any, repercussions there may be for students who fail to attend. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the attendance policy, what parts of the programme are mandatory and how this is communicated to students. They also require further evidence to demonstrate how students were made aware of what effect contravening this policy may have on their ability to progress through the programme.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must provide further detail of how the formal procedure in place to deal with any concerns about students' profession related conduct is effectively communicated to the workplace mentors.

Reason: Documentation at the visit provided the education provider's fitness to practise policy. There was a website link in the programme handbook to the education providers' regulations which included all regulations and the fitness to practise policy. However, during meeting with the workplace mentors it was noted that workplace mentors did not have adequate information about the fitness to practise policy. The visitors clarified to the workplace mentors that workplace mentors should know the formal procedure in place to deal with any concerns about students' profession related conduct. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise programme documentation to ensure that the formal procedure in place to deal with any concerns about students' profession related conduct is effectively communicated to the workplace mentors.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to remove instances of incorrect information about student progression.

Reason: In reviewing the programme documentation the visitors noted some variability in the terminology to describe student progression within the programme. For example, in the programme handbook (p 15) there are references to the achievement of a minimum passing mark of 40%, in the same handbook (p88 module descriptors) there are also references to the achievement of a minimum passing mark 50%. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that programme documentation has inconsistent information associated with student progression. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team ensure the information provided to students clearly specifies the criteria for student progression.

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and those exit awards which do not.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing the programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors noted there was a lack of clarity when considering the exit awards for the programme. The programme handbook does not clearly state that only Post graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) will lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration (p14).The visitors could not determine how students were informed about the various awards and their impact on the eligibility of a student to apply for the Register. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

<div align="right">

Jennifer Caldwell
Angela Ariu

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	15 – 17 January 2013

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 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 HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 4 March 2013 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 27 March 2013. 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 22 April 2013. 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 4 July 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC 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) Operating Department Practice, DipHE Operating Department Practice and MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational therapist) Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	6 per cohort once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Will Diver (University of Plymouth)
Secretary	Jo Melhuish (University of Plymouth) Kahila Smith (University of Plymouth) Cirstie Rennie (University of Plymouth) Claire Ellis (University of Plymouth)
Members of the joint panel	Clair Parkin (College of Occupational Therapy) Chris McKenna (College of Occupational Therapy) Christine Craik (College of Occupational Therapy) Claire Brewis (External Panel member) Beth Gompertz (Internal Panel member) Val Heath (Internal Panel member) Mel Joyner (Internal Panel member) Sharon Wilkinson (Internal Panel member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, 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 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The education provider must implement formal protocols to obtain informed consent for when students participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided, through discussion with the students and during the meeting with programme team, that there were no formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical and clinical teaching. During discussion with the students it was clear that informed consent was not obtained, although the students felt they could opt-out from participating with no impact on their learning. The visitors noted the programme used a range of teaching methods including role plays, practising techniques with equipment for the profession. The visitors were concerned that without consent protocols in place there would be nothing to mitigate any risk involved in students participating as service users. The visitors could not determine how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained or how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors have noted the other programmes being reviewed at this visit used consent procedures which could be adapted for this programme. The visitors therefore require evidence that the programme team implement formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme or annually) and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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

Condition: The education provider must identify where on the programme students' attendance is mandatory and how the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

Reason: The visitors noted that, in the documentation provided, there was no explicit reference to where and when attendance is mandatory for students on the programme. In discussion with the students it was highlighted that there is an attendance policy and that students are aware of when attendance is mandatory. The visitors also discussed the attendance policy with the programme team who highlighted that an attendance policy for this programmes was available. However, the visitors were unsure how students starting the programme would be informed of the attendance policy, how it would be enforced and what, if any, repercussions there may be for students who fail to attend. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the attendance policy, what parts of the programme are mandatory and how this is communicated to students. They also require further evidence to demonstrate how students were made aware of what effect contravening this policy may have on their ability to progress through the programme.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must provide further detail of how the formal procedure in place to deal with any concerns about students' profession related conduct is effectively communicated to the workplace mentors.

Reason: Documentation at the visit provided the education provider's fitness to practise policy. There was a website link in the programme handbook to the education providers' regulations which included all regulations and the fitness to practise policy. However, during meeting with the workplace mentors it was noted that workplace mentors did not have adequate information about the fitness to practise policy. The visitors clarified to the workplace mentors that workplace mentors should know the formal procedure in place to deal with any concerns about students' profession related conduct. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise programme documentation to ensure that the formal procedure in place to deal with any concerns about students' profession related conduct is effectively communicated to the workplace mentors.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to remove instances of incorrect information about student progression.

Reason: In reviewing the programme documentation the visitors noted some variability in the terminology to describe student progression within the programme. For example, in the programme handbook (p 15) there are references to the achievement of a minimum passing mark of 40%, in the same handbook (p88 module descriptors) there are also references to the achievement of a minimum passing mark 50%. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that programme documentation has inconsistent information associated with student progression. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team ensure the information provided to students clearly specifies the criteria for student progression.

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and those exit awards which do not.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing the programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors noted there was a lack of clarity when considering the exit awards for the programme. The programme handbook does not clearly state that only Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) will lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration (p14).The visitors could not determine how students were informed about the various awards and their impact on the eligibility of a student to apply for the Register. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

<div align="right">

Jennifer Caldwell
Angela Ariu

</div>

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme name	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of visit	15 – 17 January 2013

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Operating department practioner' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 5 March 2013 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 27 March 2013. 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 22 April 2013. 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 4 July 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC 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 – BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) and Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration). The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
	Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
HCPC observer	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort once per year
First approved intake	September 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Will Diver (University of Plymouth)
Secretary	Jo Melhuish (University of Plymouth)
	Kahila Smith (University of Plymouth)
	Cirstie Rennie (University of Plymouth)
	Claire Ellis (University of Plymouth)
Members of the joint panel	Lloyd Howell (College of Operating Department Practice)
	Mike Donnellon (External Panel member)
	Beth Gompertz (Internal Panel member)
	Val Heath (Internal Panel member)
	Mel Joyner (Internal Panel member)

	Sharon Wilkinson (Internal Panel member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

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 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

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 revisit the advertising materials for the programme to ensure they are providing all the information potential applicants require for them to make an informed choice about the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the online information and the advertising leaflet for the programme. They noted there was some information not included that they considered important for applicants to be able to make informed choices about the programme. This information included details about the award to be gained and mandatory admissions procedures (the occupational health check and enhanced CRB check). In order that the programme meets this standard the visitors require the education provider to revisit the advertising materials to ensure this information is included.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit information that includes details about the module leaders for this programme.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included programme team staff CV's and descriptions of the modules. The visitors noted the documentation did not have details of who the module leaders are. The visitors were therefore unable to determine that subject areas are being taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. In order to determine this standard is met the visitors require information that demonstrates who the module leaders are for each module.

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

Condition: The education provider must amend programme documentation to remove references to the HCPC having a statutory attendance requirement for students and to amend inaccuracies.

Reason: The visitors noted within the documentation provided, there were references to the HCPC having a statutory attendance requirements, "This is to ensure compliance with the statutory attendance requirements of the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC)" (Practice Competency Assessment – year one, P11). The HCPC enforces no statutory requirements for attendance of students for academic learning or practice placement learning. For accuracy the visitors require these references to be amended throughout the documentation. The visitors also noted other inaccuracies through the documentation which need to be corrected. For example, in the programme handbook p39, there is a reference to appendix 3 for module descriptors however appendix 3 is the end of placement feedback form and on p61 there is a reference to appendix 2 which is also incorrect. The visitors require all inaccuracies and incorrect references to be corrected within the documentation.

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 finalised descriptions of the modules for this programme.

Reason: During the visit discussion indicated revisions would be made to the module descriptors concerning some learning outcomes and general amendments. The visitors will need to determine the learning outcomes of the revised module descriptors will ensure those who successfully complete the programme will meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. Therefore the visitors require the education provider submit revised module descriptors for review.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate they have immediate access to details regarding the mentors working with students from this programme.

Reason: Documentation provided for this visit stated "a 'live' mentor database is kept of all staff that mentor ODP students" (SETs mapping document, SET 5.6). At the visit the visitors viewed the database and were informed it was a voluntary database into which information was populated by members from the individual practice placement areas. The visitors were concerned this could mean it was difficult for the programme team to be able to know who was working with their students at any given time and to be able to ensure those mentors were appropriately qualified and experienced. Upon raising this concern with the programme team it was stated the information collected from the placements audits included details about the mentors and this was inputted onto the system, it was also described that individual placement areas maintained lists of where students were placed and the programme team could ask for access to these lists. The visitors were satisfied the information was available however were concerned the programme team did not have direct access to information about who students were located with. The visitors additionally have not seen the evidence that the information collected through the audit process is being inputted onto a system accessible to the programme team. The visitors therefore require evidence that the programme team have immediate access to information regarding who their students are working with at any time and information to be able to ensure that those mentors were appropriately qualified and experienced.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate they have immediate access to details regarding the training undertaken by mentors working with students from this programme.

Reason: Documentation provided for this visit stated "a 'live' mentor database is kept of all staff that mentor ODP students" (SETs mapping document, SET 5.6). At the visit the visitors viewed the database and were informed it was a voluntary database into which information was populated by members from the individual practice placement areas.

The visitors were concerned this could mean it was difficult for the programme team to be able to know who was working with their students at any given time and to be able to ensure those mentors had been appropriately trained. Upon raising this concern with the programme team it was stated the information collected from the placement audits included these details about the mentors and this was inputted onto their system. The visitors were satisfied the information was available from the audits however have not seen the evidence that the information collected through the audit process is being inputted onto a system accessible to the programme team. The visitors therefore require evidence the programme team have immediate access to information regarding who their students are working with at any given time and are able to ensure those mentors are appropriately trained.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must submit finalised descriptions of the modules for this programme.

Reason: During the visit discussion indicated revisions would be made to the module descriptors concerning some learning outcomes and general amendments. The visitors will need to determine the assessment of the learning outcomes in the revised module descriptors will ensure those who successfully complete the programme will meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. Therefore the visitors require the education provider submit revised module descriptors for review.

Recommendations

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Recommendation: When the education provider's appointed external examiner reaches the end of their term, the HCPC may need to be informed through the major change process.

Reason: Through the documentation the visitors noted it was anticipated the external examiner for the programme would be due to reach the end of their term in this position in the next year or so. The visitors wished the education provider to note that the programme must have at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the register and if the new person to take up this role was not from the relevant part of the Register, the HCPC would need to be informed through the major change process.

Penny Joyce
Tony Scripps