

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme name	PG Dip Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapy
Date of visit	28 and 29 May 2008

Contents

Executive summary	2
ntroduction	
Visit details	
Sources of evidence	
Recommended outcome	
Conditions	
Recommendations	
Commendations	

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 Physiotherapist 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 on 18 August 2008. At the Education and Training Committee's meeting on 18 August 2008, 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 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 BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme. 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. 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	Ms Liz Holey (Physiotherapist) Mrs Katie Bosworth (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Katherine Lock
Proposed student numbers	35
Initial approval	4 April 2001
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2008
Chair	Ms Julie Wilkinson
Secretary	Mrs Kathy Sherlock
Members of the joint panel	Mr Jim Pickard (Huddersfield University)
	Ms Helena Johnson (External Panel Member)
	Mrs Sue Hammersley (External Panel Member)

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			
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			
University prospectus			

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	\boxtimes		
Programme team	\boxtimes		
Placements providers and educators/mentors	\boxtimes		
Students	\boxtimes		
Learning resources	\boxtimes		
Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)			

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 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 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

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide: 5.3.1 a safe environment

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence of a risk assessment process in place before a new placement is used.

Reason: During various discussions it became apparent that student placements are not risk assessed by the education provider before a new placement is used. The visitors would like to be assured that a system is in place to risk assess any new placements should the need arise.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence of a detailed formal process of ongoing monitoring of all placements.

Reason: There is no current formal mechanism in place for the ongoing monitoring of placements. The programme team explained that the strategic health authorities assess each placement but the information is not then sent to and stored by the university, the university assumes that the assessment is effective. There is a detailed student evaluation of placements by students but no evidence of analysis and action with this information. The visitors would like to be confident that there is a mechanism in place to effectively monitor all placements in use by the university.

5.13 The placement providers must have an equal opportunities and antidiscriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence of mechanisms in place to make sure equal opportunities and antidiscriminatory policies are in place within each placement used by the university.

Reason: There is no current formal mechanism in place for the ongoing monitoring of placements. The strategic health authorities assess each placement but the information is not then sent and stored by the university, therefore the university assumption that the assessment is effective. The education provider needs to be monitoring the existence of an antidiscriminatory policy and equal opportunity policy as part of the ongoing monitoring of placements.

Recommendations

2.1 The admission procedures must give both applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make or take up the offer of a place on a programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting all documentation to standardise statements in relation to regulatory and professional body requirements.

Reason: All module descriptors stated that compulsory completion of the module is needed for membership with the professional body. However, students may get the impression that the professional body requires all learning outcomes to be completed and the Health Professions Council does not. This is not the case since the programme is approved due to the learning outcomes providing the students with the skills they need to meet the standards of proficiency.

2.1 The admission procedures must give both applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make or take up the offer of a place on a programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider updating the use of terminology within the documentation.

Reason: Although the correct information has been given with regard to Health Profession Council registration, terms throughout the rest of the documentation, such as state registration and licence to practice, are out of date.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The use of students from other relevant disciplines to buddy the physiotherapy students on placement.

Reason: The visitors felt this learning technique was innovative and a good way in which students can gain inter professional learning skills. The students also were very complimentary of this style of learning.

Ms Liz Holey Mrs Katie Bosworth