

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	St George's, University of London
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Radiography
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiography
<b>Date of visit</b>	16 to 17 April 2008

## Contents

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

## **Executive summary**

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme at the education provider. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee on 10 June 2008. At this meeting, the Committee confirmed the ongoing approval of the programme. This means that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

## **Introduction**

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - curriculum standards and assessment standards. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Mrs Helen Best (Diagnostic Radiographer) Professor Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic Radiographer)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	61
Initial approval	5 January 1998
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2008
Chair	Professor Sean Hilton (St George's, University of London)
Secretary	Caroline Dacey/Derek Baldwinson (St George's, University of London)
Members of the joint panel	Dr Pauline Reeves (St George's, University of London /Society of Radiographers) Mark Hulse (St Georges, University of London /Society of Radiographers) Dr Ralph Manly (St George's University of London) Dr Elizabeth Miles (St George's University of London)

## Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

## Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

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

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

## Recommendations

### **2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria, including criminal conviction checks.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider keeping under review the system of obtaining criminal conviction checks to ensure the currency of the criminal record check previously made.

**Reason:** The programme team explained fully the procedure for dealing with potential criminal convictions that might be presented by an applicant or once a student is enrolled on the programme. The visitors were satisfied with the evidence provided by the education provider; however the visitors wanted the education provider to keep the procedures under review to ensure that all criminal checks are considered fully and equitably.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should assure themselves that they have fully considered the comments from the external examiners regarding assessment burden.

**Reason:** In the external examiners reports provided to the visitors for the visit it was clear that the external examiners had advised the programme team that the assessment burden was very high and advised that the assessment burden could be reduced as part of the review. 'The visitors noted that there had been some reduction in the assessment burden and that the education provider was keeping this under review.'

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider an enhancement to the attendance policy to make it clearer for staff and students.

**Reason:** Although evidence was provided to set out the attendance policy was in place and the visitors were satisfied with the policy, the visitors would advise the education provider to enhance the policy to ensure that there could be no misinterpretation by staff or students.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should keep under review the assessment feedback procedures to enhance the student experience.

**Reason:** The visitors felt that the feedback systems in place were sufficient but during discussions with the students it was commented that the time targets and the information provided back to students were not always adequate to give the students the feedback they required in a timely manner. The visitors acknowledge the extent of formative assessment built into programme delivery

and how the programme team attempt to give continuous messages to students about their progress.

Mrs Helen Best  
Professor Angela Duxbury