

1a. Informal Interview with Candidate (15 – 20 minutes) - NOT DISCUSSED AS VERIFICATION DID NOT TAKE PLACE

Based on requirements of meeting the HCPC SETs. STANDARD MET:	Y	N
Describe your formal trust and departmental induction process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
How were you made aware of the location of the policies on equal opportunities and anti-discrimination?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Describe what you should do if you feel that you may have been discriminated against or if you have concerns about the safety and well-being of service users.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
How were you made aware of the grievance procedure and how to initiate it?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do you feel you have followed a structured training programme?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Was your training supportive to satisfy all of the above?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Were there any difficulties in delivering your training?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Were there any other trainees?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Was all the training done on one site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Was there any rotation or collaboration with other departments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Can you give examples of being able to take part in inter-professional learning? (learning with and from other professionals)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1b. Specific requirements to confirm standards for IBMS Approval for Pre-registration Training are being met. - NOT DISCUSSED AS VERIFICATION DID NOT TAKE PLACE

Based on requirements of meeting the HCPC SETs. STANDARD MET:	Y	N
Was a copy of the training programme made available?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does each trainee have a nominated HCPC registered training officer/mentor?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do they have access to current textbooks and journals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do they have access to a quiet area for study?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the Department have a training notice board? (wall or electronic)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the Department have a Health & Safety notice board? (wall or electronic)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Did the candidate or training officer wish to make any further comments about the training process?
- NOT DISCUSSED AS VERIFICATION DID NOT TAKE PLACE

2. Verification of the Registration Portfolio (maximum length – 90 minutes)

Please include your comments below on the candidate's disposition, only if you feel it may have affected the verification process.

N/A

SECTION 1 – PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

SECTION 1 – Module 1: Personal Responsibility and Development

HCPC STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY COVERED	STANDARDS MET	PLEASE INDICATE WHICH (IF ANY) STANDARDS HAVE NOT BEEN MET
Knowledge standards SoP numbers: 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.4, 4.6, 11.1	<input type="checkbox"/>	3.3, 4.4, 4.6, 11.1
Competence standards SoP numbers: 1, 2, 2.4, 2.7, 2.8, 3, 4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 11, 14.1	<input type="checkbox"/>	2, 4, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 11, 14.1

COMMENTS

Please indicate the range of evidence provided, highlighting any strong or weak areas.

- 1) Witness statement
- 2) HCPC essay
- 3) Transfusion guidelines/regulations statement – good piece of evidence but ?different writing style

SECTION 1 – Module 2: Equality and Diversity		
HCPC STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY COVERED	STANDARDS MET	PLEASE INDICATE WHICH (IF ANY) STANDARDS HAVE NOT BEEN MET
Knowledge standards SoP numbers: 5, 5.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Competence standards SoP numbers: 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
COMMENTS		
<p>Please indicate the range of evidence provided, highlighting any strong or weak areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Certificate of elearning – not appropriately annotated 2) Witness statement of presentation 3) Presentation – not signed off <p>Evidence 2 & 3 are really only one activity, should not both be used. Evidence 1 is just a certificate, doesn't show what has been learned.</p>		

SECTION 1 – Module 3: Communication		
HCPC STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY COVERED	STANDARDS MET	PLEASE INDICATE WHICH (IF ANY) STANDARDS HAVE NOT BEEN MET
Knowledge standards SoP numbers: 8.3, 8.6, 8.7, 8.8, 8.9	<input type="checkbox"/>	8.3, 8.6, 8.8, 8.9
Competence standards SoP numbers: 8, 8.1, 8.2, 8.4, 8.5, 14.34	<input type="checkbox"/>	14.34
COMMENTS		
<p>Please indicate the range of evidence provided, highlighting any strong or weak areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Annotated handover sheet – would have been better evidence to use one filled in by Awat 2) Witness statement on handover sheet 3) Explanation of handover sheet – dated by candidate 19/01/2022, signed off by TO 24/04/2020 ?? <p>All three pieces are for the same activity, not covering other methods of communication</p>		

SECTION 1 – Module 4: Patient Records and Data Handling		
HCPC STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY COVERED	STANDARDS MET	PLEASE INDICATE WHICH (IF ANY) STANDARDS HAVE NOT BEEN MET
Knowledge standard SoP numbers: 7, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 10.2, 10.3, 10.5, 10.6	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.1, 7.3, 10.3,
Competence standards SoP numbers: 7, 10, 10.1, 10.3, 10.4	<input type="checkbox"/>	10.3
COMMENTS		
<p>Please indicate the range of evidence provided, highlighting any strong or weak areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Annotated blood pack picture – excellent piece of evidence 2) Environmental monitoring sheet – sheets filled in, but no explanation of what for or how it demonstrates SoP 3) Certificate of elearning and accompanying statement – where is this diagram from? If you made it, make that clear! If not, reference. Signed off 14/02/2022 		

SECTION 1 – Module 5: Professional Relationships		
HCPC STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY COVERED	STANDARDS MET	PLEASE INDICATE WHICH (IF ANY) STANDARDS HAVE NOT BEEN MET
Knowledge standards SoP numbers: 9.2, 9.3, 9.5, 13.3, 13.4, 13.5	<input type="checkbox"/>	9.3, 13.5
Competence standards SoP numbers: 9, 9.1, 9.4, 12.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
COMMENTS		
<p>Please indicate the range of evidence provided, highlighting any strong or weak areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Stem cell transplant flow chart – fantastic piece of evidence, candidate really thought about how patient pathway was affected. 2) Reflective practice on PITS course – Nice reflection, but was this to cover the statutory reflective piece for this section (see below)? May need expanded/make that a bit clearer. 3) Service user engagement essay and leaflets – Noted that this was to cover 9.3, but mostly concerning consent (SoP 2.7), leaflets show minimal annotation, is not evident why they are included/what they add. Not a reflective piece. 		
<p>IMPORTANT:</p> <p>The candidate must produce a reflective statement on how the engagement with service users and learning with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions has contributed positively to their professional development (HCPC SoP 9.3, 12.2)</p> <p>Please comment specifically on this in terms of identified outcomes.</p> <p>Evidence 3 was mapped to SoP 9.3, but was not reflective and primarily concerned consent. Evidence 2 was reflective, but didn't really cover the SoPs required by this piece. SoP 12.2 was covered in Evidence 1.</p>		

SECTION 2 – PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE		
SECTION 2 – Module 1: Professional Knowledge		
HCPC STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY COVERED	STANDARDS MET	PLEASE INDICATE WHICH (IF ANY) STANDARDS HAVE NOT BEEN MET
Knowledge standards SoP numbers: 13, 13.1, 13.2, 13.6, 13.7, 13.8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Competence standards SoP numbers: 14, 14.14, 14.17, 14.18, 14.19, 14.20, 14.21, 14.23, 14.24, 14.25, 15.6	<input type="checkbox"/>	14, 14.19, 14.20, 14.21, 14.23, 14.25, 15.6
COMMENTS		
<p>Please indicate the range of evidence provided, highlighting any strong or weak areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Breast cancer essay – from university, only first page annotated. Could do with annotation which is relevant to your practice 2) Uni certificate and transcript – no annotation or reflection 3) Particle counter description and use –shows good understanding and regular participation in monitoring, where is the table from? Ref where info is from. Signed off 11/01/2022. 		

SECTION 2 – Module 2: Health and Safety		
HCPC STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY COVERED	STANDARDS MET	PLEASE INDICATE WHICH (IF ANY) STANDARDS HAVE NOT BEEN MET
Knowledge standards SoP numbers: 15, 15.1, 15.2, 13.11	<input type="checkbox"/>	13.11
Competence standards SoP numbers: 15.2, 15.3, 15.4, 15.5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
COMMENTS		
<p>Please indicate the range of evidence provided, highlighting any strong or weak areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) H&S elearning certificate and explanation – shows learning outcomes, would be better if contained more how it applies to your role 2) Annotated photos of PPE use – very good piece of evidence covering correct use and risks 3) Explanation of biological hazard groups and associated containment levels –no explanation of containment levels. Unfortunately there are chunks of this evidence taken directly from the Approved List of Biological Agents from the ACDP, without referencing!! Signed off 14/01/2022. 		

SECTION 2 – Module 3: Quality		
HCPC STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY COVERED	STANDARDS MET	PLEASE INDICATE WHICH (IF ANY) STANDARDS HAVE NOT BEEN MET
Knowledge standards SoP numbers: 11.2, 12.3, 12.5, 12.7, 14.15, 14.16	<input type="checkbox"/>	12.5, 14.16
Competence standards SoP numbers: 12, 12.1, 12.4, 12.5, 12.6, 12.8, 12.9	<input type="checkbox"/>	12.5, 12.6, 12.9
COMMENTS		
<p>Please indicate the range of evidence provided, highlighting any strong or weak areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Witness statement temperature logging including Awat's report –nice to see her report but if including photos please annotate 2) Explanation of PULSE and witness statement 3) Incident report – good choice for evidence but would have been nice to see reflection. Signed off 03/02/2022. 		

SECTION 2 – Module 4: Performing Standard Investigations		
HCPC STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY COVERED	STANDARDS MET	PLEASE INDICATE WHICH (IF ANY) STANDARDS HAVE NOT BEEN MET
Knowledge standards SoP numbers: 13.10, 14.22	<input type="checkbox"/>	14.22
Competence standards SoP numbers: 13.9, 14.2, 14.3, 14.4, 14.5, 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, 14.9, 14.10, 14.11, 14.12, 14.13, 14.26	<input type="checkbox"/>	13.9, 14.4, 14.5, 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, 14.9, 14.10, 14.11, 14.12, 14.13
COMMENTS		
<p>Please indicate the range of evidence provided, highlighting any strong or weak areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Placement essay –reflective practice would have been more appropriate, or write more about the general lab skills you acquired 2) Point of care statement and certificate – no reflection included, certificates not annotated. 3) Flow cytometer explanation – nice explanation but of a task candidate cannot perform until registered. Signed off 18/02/2022. 		

SECTION 2 – Module 5: Research and Development		
HCPC STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY COVERED	STANDARDS MET	PLEASE INDICATE WHICH (IF ANY) STANDARDS HAVE NOT BEEN MET
Knowledge standards SoP numbers: 14.30, 14.31	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Competence standards SoP numbers: 14.27, 14.28, 14.29, 14.32, 14.33	<input type="checkbox"/>	14.28, 14.29, 14.32
COMMENTS		
<p>Please indicate the range of evidence provided, highlighting any strong or weak areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Scientific poster – from when at uni, no reflection or annotation to bring up to date/relate to current practice 2) Uni project abstract –again, no reflection or annotation. Signed off 08/02/2022. 3) Quantitative vs qualitative – covers main points well, some good examples relating directly to lab work <u>HOWEVER</u> there are chunks of this taken directly from scribbr.com <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>		

OVERALL COMMENTS ON PORTFOLIO
<p>Room for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several pieces such as certificates which on their own do not evidence demonstration of knowledge/competence – should be annotated with relevant info such as how the knowledge gained has impacted your practice, or a reflective learning. • Annotation generally was poor, and did not cover the relevant SoP. An exception was the blood pack picture with attached statement, you applied this well to the data handling section. • Although some attempt at mapping the evidence to standards has been done in the justifications document, there are many SoPs which have not been met. When looking at the evidence I was trying to tick any addition standards I felt you had met but not mapped, but this step should really be done prior to applying for verification – for the future perhaps a spreadsheet or table of the SoPs would be helpful, and corresponding evidence pieces can be marked against it as they are finished? • Good evidence of marking and feedback • Portfolio seems rushed, some pieces dated after application for verification – candidate should be deemed ready before applying • Evidence of plagiarism which results in a fail – referred to IBMS <p>These points were discussed with TO when cancelling verification date.</p>

3. Tour of Laboratory (maximum length – 40 minutes) - TOUR/VERIFICATION DID NOT TAKE PLACE

This is an opportunity to observe the training environment and candidate's knowledge and understanding of the service delivery. The candidate should be able to demonstrate an understanding of the routine service and respond correctly to pro-active questioning.

The criteria below should be verified in accordance with the knowledge and understanding of the candidate in respect of the discipline(s) in which their training has taken place.

CANDIDATE ABILITY	STANDARD MET	STANDARD NOT MET
Candidate was able to show they knew the correct procedures for handling specimens, pre and post analysis.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Candidate was able to show a knowledge and application of health & safety requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Candidate was able to show they knew how to use the main laboratory computer system in accordance with service requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Candidate was able to show they knew how to operate equipment used in the preparation and analysis of samples	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS
Please provide a brief summary of the topics covered on the tour and the candidate's scope of practice. Tour was cancelled, portfolio showed evidence of plagiarism.

The Institute has published 'Clinical Laboratory Standards' for the approval of laboratories for pre- and post- registration training. Based on these criteria, the laboratory tour also gives the external verifier an opportunity to judge whether the laboratory has the appropriate requirements for training against the standards below.

OVERALL STANDARDS- NOT DISCUSSED AS VERIFICATION DID NOT TAKE PLACE	STANDARD MET	STANDARD NOT MET
Environment, Facilities and Equipment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Health and Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Workload and Staffing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Education and Training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Documentation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Feedback Comments to Trainer and Candidates

This also provides an opportunity to seek further clarification on points of evidence if required.

FEEDBACK:

As discussed/above

COMMENDATIONS: Highlight any areas of good practice.

I especially liked the Stem cell transplant flow chart piece of evidence, candidate had obviously thought about the patient pathway.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Please note this is meant to be constructive and helpful where you are able to suggest one or two areas where future training may benefit.

Recommendations must be consistent with IBMS guidelines for registration training and portfolio completion.

N/A

5. Result of Verification

If completion of any academic study is still outstanding, the verifier should recommend the award of the Certificate of Competence subject to the relevant evidence being submitted to the Institute.

AWARD OF CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCE RECOMMENDED

YES ☐

NO ☒

If degree has not been completed or if further evidence is required, please indicate below.
(Continue on extra sheet if necessary.)

Portfolio failed as evidence of plagiarism in portfolio

TRAINING APPROVAL OF THE LABORATORY RECOMMENDED

YES ☐

NO ☐

If No, indicate further evidence required. (Continue on extra sheet if necessary.)

- TOUR/ VERIFICATION DID NOT TAKE PLACE, UNABLE TO ASSESS LAB FOR TRAINING APPROVAL

IS THERE ANY PARTICULAR ISSUE YOU WISH TO BRING TO THE ATTENTION OF THE INSTITUTE?

As previously discussed on phone and by email, there is evidence of plagiarism in this portfolio.

I confirm that this external verification has been carried out in a manner consistent with the guidelines provided and in line with the requirements of the Institute of Biomedical Science and that the candidate is previously unknown to me.

Verifier Name:

Signature:

Date:

In providing IBMS with the information requested you are consenting to its use as indicated in the IBMS Privacy Notice. Further information can be found on the IBMS website at www.ibms.org/privacy

Institute of Biomedical Science, 12 Coldbath Square, London EC1R 5HL

Tel 020 7713 0214 Fax: 020 7837 9658 E-mail registration@ibms.org Website: www.ibms.org

External verifiers report for the Verification of the Registration Training Portfolio for the Certificate of Competence