

## Visitors' report

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Name of education provider</b>      | New College Durham                     |
| <b>Validating body / Awarding body</b> | Teesside University                    |
| <b>Programme name</b>                  | Prescription Only Medicine Certificate |
| <b>Mode of delivery</b>                | Part time                              |
| <b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>         | Prescription only medicine             |
| <b>Date of visit</b>                   | 5 – 6 June 2013                        |

## Contents

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| Executive summary .....   | 2 |
| Introduction.....         | 3 |
| Visit details .....       | 3 |
| Sources of evidence ..... | 4 |
| Recommended outcome ..... | 5 |
| Conditions.....           | 6 |

## 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' or 'Podiatrist' 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. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At the Committee meeting, the programme was approved. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

## Introduction

The 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 validating body validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a Certificate of Local Anaesthesia and BSc (Hons) Podiatry. The validating body, 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 validating body and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession                    | Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)<br>Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)  |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance)                  | Nicola Baker  |
| Proposed student numbers                                | 8   |
| First approved intake                                   | July 2009   |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2013  |
| Chair   | Liz Holey (Teesside University)   |
| Secretary   | John Holmes (Teesside University)   |
| Members of the joint panel                              | Jacquie Horner (Internal Panel Member)<br>Tim James (Internal Panel Member)<br>Paul Stone (Internal Panel Member)<br>Diana Lesnic (Internal Panel Member)<br>Scott Bullock (Internal Panel Member)<br>Paul Fletcher (External Panel Member)<br>Richard Robley (External Panel Member)<br>Wilfred Foxe (The Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists)<br>Alan Wood (The Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists)<br>Alison Barlow (The Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists) |

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

The HCPC did not review a mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs prior to the visit as a mapping document was not required by the visitors as the programme is a post-registration qualification.

The HCPC did not review a practice placement handbook as the 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 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Learning resources  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation<br>(eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The HCPC did not meet with the students as they were unable to attend the visit.

## 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 48 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 9 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 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 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 programme advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants are made aware of criminal checks associated with the programme on entry.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the 'Course guide' document which will be used to inform applicants about the programme. The entry requirements state that applicants to the course must be registered with the HCPC as a podiatrist / chiropodist. The document also details further considerations, including that applicants must comply with HCPC standards related to fitness to practise. In discussions with the programme team at the visit, it was confirmed that applicants would need to provide evidence that they have an up to date criminal records check as part of the admissions procedure. However, the visitors could not see any information in the documentation to confirm this process, or to demonstrate how potential applicants would be informed of this requirement. The visitors were also unsure as to whether applicants would need to pay for their own criminal records check if they did not already have the evidence. The visitors also noted that the 'Course guide' for the programme states that the module is worth 20 credits, rather than 10 credits. The visitors therefore need to see revised advertising materials for the programme to demonstrate how applicants will be enabled to make an informed decision as to whether to apply to the programme.

### **2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence in the documentation as to how the equality and diversity policy is implemented and monitored in admissions.

**Reason:** The education provider described in the SETs mapping document how the education provider embeds equality and diversity issues into the programme's delivery through staff updates and induction sessions for the students. However, the visitors were unable to determine what the equality and diversity policy being applied in the admissions process was. The visitors could also not determine, from the evidence provided, what processes are in place for collecting information on the implementation and monitoring of the policy. In discussion at the visit, the programme team stated that they have guidance around equality and diversity issues available to staff at interviews and that the policy is monitored throughout admissions. However, the visitors did not see evidence of the guidance or any associated monitoring processes. The visitors therefore require further evidence to determine how the education provider's equality and diversity policy is implemented and monitored in admissions to ensure this standard is being met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure it contains accurate information about policies and regulations that students will be subject to throughout the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with additional documentation at the visit relating to various policies and procedures, including a mapping document which stated whether the education provider or validating body's quality processes would be used for this programme, and copies of regulations relating to student discipline, complaints and fitness to practice. However, the visitors could not find these processes referenced in the student handbook, and therefore were unclear as to how students are notified as to what procedures and regulations are in place. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that the regulations and policies students will be subject to, particularly fitness to practise, are clearly articulated or referenced in the programme documentation.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure it contains accurate information and is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for podiatrists / chiropodists.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit and noted inaccurate references made to the HCPC. There was reference to the level of attendance expected of students in the student handbook (page 37), which implies that the HCPC requires students to attend all practical modules. The HCPC SETs outline that the education provider must determine appropriate attendance requirements for their programmes. The visitors also noted that the attendance requirements as outlined in this document are not entirely applicable to this programme as they refer to the Clinical Practice modules of the BSc (Hons) Podiatry programme and detail a student's attendance requirements in relation to eligibility to progress to the next level of the BSc (Hons) Podiatry programme. The visitors considered such references to be potentially misleading to students. It was also noted by the visitors that overall there were limited references to the HCPC or the HCPC's publications in the student handbook or other student-facing documentation. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the programme documentation to remove any instances of inaccurate or out of date terminology throughout and ensure that students are well-informed of the regulatory setting for podiatrists / chiropodists.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide any documentation that is revised as a result of the validation process.

**Reason:** Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend the programme documentation, including the module descriptor, learning outcomes and assessment as part of the post visit process for the new validating body. If any changes are to be made the visitors will need to review them. The visitors therefore require the education provider to resubmit the programme documentation where changes are made, or confirm the previously submitted documentation is not subject to change. In this way the visitors can ensure that this SET is met.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide clarification and final confirmation of the assessment strategy, to demonstrate how this will comply with the assessment regulations of the new validating body.

**Reason:** In the documentation, the programme team provided links to the assessment regulations at the new validating body. However, the visitors were unable to find explicit confirmation in the documentation as to the reassessment or resubmission procedures that would be in place for this programme specifically. At the visit, the programme team discussed these issues with colleagues from the validating body, and the validating body set a number of conditions for the assessment strategy. These included a review of compensation, components and elements and the use of resubmission throughout the BSc (Hons) Podiatry programme. The visitors were therefore unable to determine at the visit that the programme is compliant with the validating body's assessment regulations and that this SET is met. They therefore require the education provider to explicitly document the assessment regulations that are in place for the programme.

## **6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit any revisions to the module descriptor for the programme or confirm that the previously submitted module descriptor is not subject to change.

**Reason:** As detailed in the reason for SET 6.2, discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend the module descriptor, including assessment of learning outcomes, as part of the post visit process for the new validating body. If any changes are to be made to the module descriptor, the visitors will need to review this to ensure changes will not adversely affect the assessment of the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the education provider to resubmit the programme module descriptor if any changes are made, or confirm the previously submitted module descriptor is not subject to change.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must ensure programme documentation clearly articulates the requirements for student assessment and achievement within the programme.

**Reason:** As stated in the condition under SET 6.2, the programme team provided links in the documentation to the assessment regulations at the new validating body. However, the visitors were unable to find explicit confirmation in the documentation as to any module prerequisites, reassessment procedures or other associated measures of achievement that would be in place for this programme specifically. The visitors were therefore unable to determine a clear statement on how reassessment attempts would be managed where students had not achieved all of the learning outcomes, in practice or theory. The assessment requirements, as well as the resit or resubmission arrangements for failed assessments, must be clearly outlined in the programme documentation. As stated, discussions at the visit also indicated that the programme



team may implement some changes to the assessment strategy. The visitors therefore require further clarity and confirmation in the documentation of the requirements for student achievement throughout the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation regarding aegrotat awards and that this is accessible to students.

#### **6.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for a procedure for the right of appeal for students.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence that there will be a clear appeals process available to students on the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to find reference to an appeals procedure. The visitors were provided with additional documentation at the visit relating to various policies and procedures, including a mapping document which stated whether the education provider or validating body's quality processes would be used for this programme. The mapping document states that the New College Durham 'Academic Complaints and Appeals Policy' will be updated to comply with the validating body regulations and processes. The visitors were provided with the validating body's complaints procedure, but were not provided with the procedure that will be used for students' right to appeal. The visitors were therefore not clear how a student can ask for a review of a decision made on their assessment, progression and achievement. The visitors require further information that clarifies the appeals procedure for students and details how students are told about the right to appeal to ensure this standard is met.

#### **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.**

**Condition:** The programme team must clearly specify the criteria and procedures for the appointment of external examiners for the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, this standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are

agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiner to the programme have been included in the assessment regulations to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

Catherine Smith  
Paul Blakeman