

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	18-20 January 2017

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	10

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. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 March 2017. At the Committee meeting on 25 May 2017, 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 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 HCPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, 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 following programmes – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, BSc (Hons) Occupational therapy and MPhysio Sports and Exercise Medicine. The education provider, the professional bodies 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. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) Rebecca Khanna (Occupational therapist) Christine Morgan (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah (Occupational therapy and Physiotherapy panel lead) Rebecca Stent (Diagnostic radiography panel lead)
Proposed student numbers	60 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
First approved intake	September 1997
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	Josie Fraser (University of Bradford)
Secretary	Kirstin Bell (University of Bradford)
Members of the joint panel	Chakib Kara-Zaitri (Internal Panel Member) Ed Mallen (Internal Panel Member) Farah Shah (Student Panel Member) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational therapists) Jackie Taylor (College of Occupational therapists) Nina Paterson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)

	Jacqueline Mullan (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Isabella Sarapong (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Rebecca Sandys (Society of Radiographers) Ruth Strudwick (Society of Radiographers)
--	--

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	<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"/>

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	<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"/>
Service users and carers	<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 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 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 52 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 have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence

The visitors have also made one 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.

Conditions

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.

Condition: The education provider must clarify who will pay for the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks, and how this will be communicated to applicants.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that no additional costs for students had been mentioned in the information for applicants such as the cost of DBS checks, despite the funding reforms which come into effect in September 2017. During the meeting with the students, the visitors were told that the education provider paid for the DBS checks. The programme team also agreed that they paid for the DBS checks, but they did mention that this may change for the 2017-2018 academic year. As such, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they let applicants know about the additional costs associated with the DBS checks.

2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate what the health requirements are, how they are appropriate to the content of the programme, and how students are told about these requirements

Reason: From a review of the admissions documentation available to applicants, the visitors noted that the education provider outlines that, as part of fulfilling the entry requirements to be admitted onto the programme, applicants must complete “an occupational health questionnaire and possible attendance at a medical appointment”. This was confirmed by the students at the visit. Additionally, during the student meeting at the visit, the students mentioned that they had to be vaccinated before they started on the programme. However, the visitors were unclear on what the health requirements were and where this information was made available to applicants. As the visitors did not know what the health requirements were they could not determine whether these requirements were appropriate for the content of the programme and could also not determine how the relevant health checks are carried out and processed as part of the admissions process. The education provider therefore needs to provide evidence which clearly outlines the health requirements for the programme to applicants, the appropriateness to the content of the programme and how students are told about these health requirements.

3.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that with the proposed increase in student numbers there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the staff curriculum vitae. During the visit, the senior and programme team told the visitors that they will be increasing the student numbers and would want the programme approved for 60 students. The visitors

were told that the BSc Physiotherapy academics will also teach on the new MPhysio programme (which has been asked to be approved for 50 students). At the visit, the visitors were also told about the work load model which helps manage the staff members' workloads and identify areas where they may need support. The visitors noted that the number of staff highlighted in the programme documentation was adequate for the current student numbers (55 students) the programme is approved for. However, the education provider did not demonstrate how they will ensure there will be an adequate number of staff to deliver the programme effectively, with the increase in student numbers and the additional commitments of the staff team to other programmes. Furthermore the visitors are unclear on how the work load model will ensure that there is an adequate number of staff to deliver the programme effectively. The visitors will therefore need to see evidence which demonstrates how the increase in student numbers and additional commitments of the staff team will be managed to ensure that there is an appropriate number of qualified and experienced staff for the programme.

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how students and staff are clear about the assessment regulations, including any waivers, in relation to student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the programme specification, standard assessment regulations for the University of Bradford and a document with the exceptions (waivers) to these regulations. The visitors noted that the programme uses university-wide assessment regulations but that there are four exceptions (waivers) to these regulations around student progression and achievement which apply to certain modules. However, the visitors were unclear as to how these waivers work in practice in relation to student progression and achievement throughout the programme. For example, one of the waivers specifies that 'all students undertaking modules of 40 and 60 credits will undertake units of assessment over the academic year. Each unit of assessment will be assigned an equivalent credit value.' However, the visitors did not see a breakdown of assessment or component credits within the modules, therefore they were unclear about which part of the modules these waivers would apply to. As such, the visitors could not see how students would be clear about how they progress and achieve within the programme, and how staff would be able to make consistent decisions in relation to student progression. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how students and staff are clear about the assessment regulations, including any waivers, in relation to student progression and achievement within the programme.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the programme documentation clearly articulates that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the University assessment regulations regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could not see in the assessment regulations or programme documentation where it clearly states that

aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors were also unclear on how the education provider ensures that students are aware of this. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the assessment regulations clearly specify that aegrotat award do not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is from a relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to page 3 of the guide to external examining for taught programmes: chapter 3: criteria for appointment which states that external examiners must meet “applicable criteria set out by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies.” However, the visitors could not be certain from this evidence that this would mean that the HCPC standard would be met as it is not defined in the assessment regulations as to whether the external examiners would have to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register and, if not, that there is an appropriate reason for appointing an examiner who is not from the relevant part of the Register. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations for this programme specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is from a relevant part of the HCPC Register, and, if not, that there is an appropriate reason for appointing an examiner who is not from the relevant part of the Register.

Recommendations

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that that the education provider informs the HCPC if the regulations differ from the proposed regulations approved by HCPC once they have gone through the education provider's internal validation process.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the programme specification, standard assessment regulations for the University of Bradford and a document with the exceptions (waivers) to these regulations. The visitors noted that the programme uses university-wide assessment regulations but that there are four exceptions (waivers) to these regulations around student progression and achievement which apply to certain modules. As the visitors are currently unclear about how these regulations will apply to this programme, the visitors are aware that the wording could change further once the waivers go through the education provider's validation process even after they may have been approved by the HCPC. As such, the visitors recommend that that they inform the HCPC if the regulations differ from the proposed regulations approved by HCPC.

Fleur Kitsell
Rebecca Khanna
Christine Morgan