

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Robert Gordon University
Name and titles of programme(s)	Non – Medical Prescribing
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	PT
Date of Visit	16 th May 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Jim Pickard, Chiropodist Gordon Burrow, Chiropodist
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Katherine Lock
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Bob Gammie, Chair, Associate Dean (Undergraduate Studies) Mandy Wells, HLSP Representative Lucy Jack, Secretary, Faculty Quality Officer

Scope of visit (*please tick*)

New programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students (current or past as appropriate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	24
--	----

PROGRAMME APPROVED: ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit documentation to clearly articulate the rationale available to prospective students which indicates different expectations at levels 9 and 11.

Reason: It was not clear in the documentation as to the rationale behind two different module levels. There was no information for students to make an informed choice as to which level they should enter the programme at or the process involved in choosing the level with the staff within the programme team.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the documentation to include a protocol where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: There was no explanation of a system in place for student consent when taking part in practical teaching. The programme team said there is a verbal agreement but the process was not articulated within the document.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the documentation to include the learning outcomes for Level 11 which must include safe and effective practice.

Reason: The learning outcomes differed from level 9 and level 11. Level 9 stated that on completion the student would be able to apply knowledge of medications in order to prescribe safely, appropriately and cost effectively. However there was not a learning outcome to state that the students at level 11 would achieve this.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

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

Condition: The programme must redraft and resubmit documentation which must clearly specify the processes involved in the selection, monitoring and audit of placements.

Reason: The documentation did not have clear evidence of how each placement is monitored. The HPC visitors expect the education provider to visit all placements to ensure that they are fit for purpose. The HEI should not rely upon either previous good experiences in relation to other education programmes, nor rely on the efforts of the student in determining that the placement is 'Fit for purpose'

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit documentation to clearly articulate that in cases where the role of the designated medical practitioner is delegated the university must ensure appropriate practice placement training is in place for these individuals.

Reason: There was no evidence that training for the designated medical practitioner went under compulsory training. Training is needed to ensure all students are meeting learning outcomes throughout the assessment. During meetings it became apparent that there were difficulties in training all DMPs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Recommendation: Programme team should consider the possibility of transferability, in both directions, between levels 9 and 11.

Reason: It was mentioned that the level of the module is discussed with the programme team and student at the start of the programme but there is no system in place to consider those who are excelling or struggling whilst completing the module.

SET 6. Assessment standards

Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for:

6.7.5 the appointment of at least one external examiner for the relevant part of the register

Recommendation: The programme team should stay in regular contact with the HPC with regards to the external examiner being from a relevant part of the register.

Reason: It is currently anticipated that this standard will change once it has gone through the education and training committee. We have received feedback about this standard which suggests that it may be causing difficulties to approved programmes, and may not be suitably flexible to meet the needs of the education sector. The HPC are therefore consulting on a change to this specific standard. The HPC propose that the new standard should read: 'Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.'

Commendations

- **Commendation should be given to the programme team and the successful working relationship evident between themselves and NHS Grampian**

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Jim Pickard

Gordon Burrow

Date: 24th May 2007