

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	The Robert Gordon University
Programme name	MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality / domain	Diagnostic radiography
Date of visit	14 – 15 September 2011

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	10

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. 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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 November 2011 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 6 December 2011. 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 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 6 December 2011. At the Committee meeting on 6 December 2011, the programme was approved. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the 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 programme, Post Graduate Diploma Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration). 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. A separate report exists for the other programme. 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	Helen Best (Diagnostic radiographer) Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
HPC observer	Victoria Adenungba
Proposed student numbers	16 per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approval	January 2012
Chair	Anne Stevenson (Robert Gordon University)
Secretary	Lucy Jack (Robert Gordon University)
Members of the joint panel	Roddy Smith (Internal Panel Member) Jane Williams-Butt (External Panel Member) Richard Price (Society / College of Radiographers)

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography 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

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the management structure in place for the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were presented with documentation that indicated that the Programme Leader is the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme. However, from discussions with the senior management team the visitors note that a new member of staff has been recruited to the programme team and is currently working out their notice period with their current employer. The visitors also note discussions that stated that it is highly likely that this individual will take up the role of Programme Leader when their employment begins.

The visitors finally noted discussions with the senior management team that indicated that the current Programme Leader will take on the role of Radiography Subject Lead. The visitors require evidence and clarification that outlines the education providers' future plans for the role of Programme Leader and the role of Radiography Subject Lead, including their roles and responsibilities.

3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must clarify who the named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme is.

Reason: From discussions with the senior management team the visitors note that a new member of staff has been recruited to the programme team and is currently working out their notice period with their current employer. The visitors also note discussions that stated that it is highly likely that this individual will take up the role of Programme Leader when their employment begins. The visitors finally noted discussions with the senior management team that indicated that the current Programme Leader will take on the role of Radiography Subject Lead. The visitors require clarification of who the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is.

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 provide further evidence to demonstrate how the programme ensures that students who successfully complete the programme meet the following standards of proficiency:

- **1b.1 be able to work, where appropriate, in partnership with other professionals, support staff, service users, and their relatives and carers**

- Understand the need to build and sustain professional relationships as both an independent practitioner and collaboratively as a member of a team
- Be able to interpret and act upon information from other healthcare professionals, in order to maximise health gain whilst minimising radiation dose to the service user
- **2b.4 be able to conduct appropriate diagnostic or monitoring procedures, treatment, therapy or other actions safely and skilfully**
 - Be able to perform a standard head computed tomographic (CT) examination, assist with CT examinations of the spine, chest and abdomen in acute trauma and to contribute effectively to other CT studies
- **3a.1 know and understand the key concepts of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to their profession-specific practice**
 - recognise the role of other professions in health and social care

Reason: The visitors noted discussions with the programme team which clarified how students on the programme learn about multi-professional collaboration during their practice placement experiences. In reviewing the programme documentation however, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to be sure that the programmes learning outcomes ensure that students who successfully complete the programme meet standards of proficiency (SOPs) 1b.1 and 3a.1. In particular they were unsure where and how students learned about multi-professional collaboration.

The visitors also did not have sufficient evidence to demonstrate how students who successfully complete the programme meet SOP 2.b4, specifically how to perform a standard head computed tomographic (CT) examination. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how multi-professional collaboration is taught within the programme and how students are taught how to perform a standard head (CT) examination. In this way the visitors can be sure that those students who successfully complete the programme meet all of the relevant standards of proficiency including SOPs 1b.1, 2b.4 and 3.1.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors note some reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors also note discussions with the programme team where it was stated that the standards are embedded throughout the programme. However, the visitors were unable to find evidence to clearly outline where the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are referred to in the curriculum and how the education provider ensures that students understand these standards, including

how and where they apply. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to identify how the programme team ensure that students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation to provide evidence of the mechanism in place to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors did not have sufficient evidence as to how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, or evidence of any other arrangements in place to manage this. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that those professionals who supervise students on practice placement are appropriately registered.

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 revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate how the following standards of proficiency are assessed:

- **1b.1 be able to work, where appropriate, in partnership with other professionals, support staff, service users, and their relatives and carers**
 - Understand the need to build and sustain professional relationships as both an independent practitioner and collaboratively as a member of a team
 - Be able to interpret and act upon information from other healthcare professionals, in order to maximise health gain whilst minimising radiation dose to the service user
- **2b.4 be able to conduct appropriate diagnostic or monitoring procedures, treatment, therapy or other actions safely and skilfully**
 - Be able to perform a standard head computed tomographic (CT) examination, assist with CT examinations of the spine, chest and abdomen in acute trauma and to contribute effectively to other CT studies
- **3a.1 know and understand the key concepts of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to their profession-specific practice**
 - recognise the role of other professions in health and social care

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors did not have enough evidence to determine how students are assessed to ensure that they can meet standard of proficiency 1b.1 and 3a.1, associated with multi-professional collaboration. The visitors also found insufficient evidence of an assessment to ensure that students can meet SOP 2b.4 and are able to perform

a standard head computed tomographic (CT) examination. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of how students are assessed to ensure that they can meet these and all other relevant, standards of proficiency on successful completion of the programme.

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to ensure terminology and assessment descriptions are consistent throughout.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted examples of interchangeable terminology. The visitors noted that the education provider interchangeably referred to the 'Radiography Professional Practice' modules as the 'clinical education modules'. The visitors also noted that within the module descriptor for 'Radiography Professional Practice 3', the assessment outline does not match the assessment description for the module within the programme specification document. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider review the programme documentation to ensure consistency and accuracy.

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 education provider should consider reviewing the indicative bibliography for the 'Radiography Professional Practice' modules.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors are satisfied that this standard has been met. However, from a review of the module descriptors for the 'Radiography Professional Practice' modules the visitors note that the indicative bibliography consists of the same two references for all five modules. The visitors recommend that, to better support the learning and teaching activities of these modules, the education provider may want to review the indicative bibliography for each module and expand the range of resources which students may want to utilise.

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation, including module descriptors, to further highlight where interprofessional learning takes place within the curriculum.

Reason: In discussions with the programme team the visitors were able to clearly determine which parts of the curriculum were delivered interprofessionally. However, the visitors did not have the same clarity when reviewing the programme documentation. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider may want to consider reviewing the programme documentation, including module descriptors, to clearly highlight where interprofessional learning takes place within the curriculum.

Helen Best
Shaaron Pratt