

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Teesside University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiography
<b>Date of visit</b>	6 – 8 May 2009

## Contents

Contents.....	1
Executive summary.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details.....	3
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome.....	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	9
Commendations.....	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 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. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2009. At the Committee meeting on 25 August 2009, the programme was the ongoing approval of the programme was re-confirmed. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and that the programme continues to meet 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 retains open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

The education provider changed their name at the same time as the approvals visit was carried out. This report reflects the education provider's new name.

## 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, practice placements 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 validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration), BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Physiotherapy (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. 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. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Shaaron Pratt (Radiographer) Stephen Boynes (Radiographer)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott Tracey Samuel-Smith
Proposed student numbers	40
Initial approval	1 July 2002
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	28 September 2009
Chair	Angela Morgan (Teesside University) Paul Taylor (Teesside University Diagnostic Radiography chair)
Secretary	John Holmes (Teesside University)
Members of the joint panel	Katherine Sanderson (Internal panel member) Paul Stephenson (External panel member) Mary Baker (College of

	Radiographers) Helen Jones (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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme handbook	<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 (eg 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 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 60 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 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.

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **2.2.1 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure the English language requirements are clearly articulated within the admission procedures.

**Reason:** From the documentation received prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to determine the English language requirement for the programme. During the visit, the visitors received a print out from the education provider website entitled 'English Language Courses and Requirements'. This print out stated that for Health programmes, the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level required was 6.0 – 7.0. The visitors were therefore unsure of the English language requirement for entry to the programme and would like to receive documentation which clarifies this.

### **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 education provider must ensure the protocols used to gain student consent are clearly articulated.

**Reason:** From the discussions with the students, the visitors learnt that they are asked to sign a consent form during their induction week. The students stated that they were not asked at any other point during the programme to provide their consent before participating as a patient or client. The feedback from students was that they felt obliged to participate in this type of activity. The visitors discussed this with the programme team who confirmed that students are asked to complete a consent form during the induction week but that any student can withdraw their consent at any time during the course of the programme. The visitors felt that this was not sufficiently communicated to students and would therefore like to receive documentation which clearly articulates the protocol used to gain student consent, which includes information about opting out at a later date.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly articulate the mechanisms which ensure that a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring the negotiated summer placements is undertaken.

**Reason:** From the documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that students undertake a negotiated summer placement between years 2 and 3. This could be in the students' base hospital but could be, if the student organised it, in a different country. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that the education provider's standard

educational audit does not apply to these negotiated summer placements. The visitors were therefore unsure of the systems used to approve these placements before use and monitor them on an ongoing basis, if it was necessary. The visitors would therefore like to receive further documentation which details the mechanisms used.

## Recommendations

### **5.7.3 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the expectations of professional conduct.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider including reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics within their programme documentation.

**Reason:** The visitors' are satisfied that students and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement, including information about and understanding of the expectations of professional conduct. However, the visitors could find no reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics within the documentation and would like to recommend this as an enhancement to the programme.

## Commendations

The visitors wish to commend the following aspects of the programme:

**Commendation:** The visitors' would like to commend the education provider on their commitment to maintaining service user involvement with the programme.

**Reason:** From the discussions with the programme team and service users, the visitors learnt that the education provider has employed a Projects Officer who has specific responsibility for ensuring continued service user involvement in the programme. The visitors felt that this was highly unusual and should be commended as best practice.

Shaaron Pratt  
Stephen Boynes