

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	19 – 20 January 2016

Contents

executive summary	2
ntroduction	
/isit details	
Sources of evidence	
Recommended outcome	
Recommendations	

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'physiotherapist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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. The education provider has until 14 March 2016 to provide observations on this report. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 23 March 2016. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - the programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC 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 and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the new full time route for the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the new full time route of this programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ann Green (Physiotherapist) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Diane Whitlock (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, one cohort per year
First approved intake	July 2007
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2016
Chair	Peter Luther (University of Essex)
Secretary	Rich Alderman (University of Essex)
Members of the joint panel	Fiona Elsted (Internal Panel Member) Natasha Purcell (Student Panel Member) Nina Paterson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Steven Ryall (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification			
Descriptions of the modules	\boxtimes		
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs			
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs			
Practice placement handbook			
Student handbook	\boxtimes		
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	\boxtimes		
External examiners' reports from the last two years	\boxtimes		

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	\boxtimes		
Programme team			
Placements providers and educators / mentors			
Students	\boxtimes		
Service users and carers	\boxtimes		
Learning resources			
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	\boxtimes		

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be satisfied 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 the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that the programme is approved.

The visitors did not set any conditions for the programme.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. 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 recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Recommendations

5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider strengthening the monitoring of attendance for practice placement educators when delivering new and refresher training.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and the practice placement providers, it was clear that the education provider runs regular training sessions for practice placement educators as well as ensuring a currency in their knowledge. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the monitoring of attendance of practice placement educators is currently minimal. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that practice educators are attending appropriate training, they considered the level of monitoring of training could pose a risk to the future attendance of practice educators at required training sessions. Specifically the visitors noted that the programme team could better evaluate where any additional training may be delivered to those who could not attend. Therefore, the visitors recommend that the programme team revisits the current process for monitoring the attendance of practice placement educators when delivering new and refresher training.

Ann Green Anthony Power Diane Whitlock



Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	19 – 20 January 2016

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction	
Visit details	
Sources of evidence	
Recommended outcome	
Recommendations	

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'physiotherapist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 14 March 2016 to provide observations on this report. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 23 March 2016. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC 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 and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the existing part time route for the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the existing part time route of this programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ann Green (Physiotherapist)
	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
	Diane Whitlock (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2017
Chair	Peter Luther (University of Essex)
Secretary	Rich Alderman (University of Essex)
Members of the joint panel	Fiona Elsted (Internal Panel Member)
	Natasha Purcell (Student Panel Member)
	Nina Paterson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)
	Steven Ryall (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

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

The visitors received the external examiners reports for the existing part time route for this programme.

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme			
Programme team			
Placements providers and educators / mentors			
Students	\boxtimes		
Service users and carers			
Learning resources			
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)			

The visitors met with the students on the existing part time route for this programme.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be satisfied 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 the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that the programme is approved.

The visitors did not set any conditions for the programme.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. 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 recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Recommendations

5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider strengthening the monitoring of attendance for practice placement educators when delivering new and refresher training.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and the practice placement providers, it was clear that the education provider runs regular training sessions for practice placement educators as well as ensuring a currency in their knowledge. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the monitoring of attendance of practice placement educators is currently minimal. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that practice educators are attending appropriate training, they considered the level of monitoring of training could pose a risk to the future attendance of practice educators at required training sessions. Specifically the visitors noted that the programme team could better evaluate where any additional training may be delivered to those who could not attend. Therefore, the visitors recommend that the programme team revisits the current process for monitoring the attendance of practice placement educators when delivering new and refresher training.

Ann Green Anthony Power Diane Whitlock