

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Chiropodist / Podiatrist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Podiatry
<b>Date of visit</b>	27 – 29 May 2009

## Contents

Contents.....	1
Executive summary.....	2
Introduction .....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome .....	6
Conditions .....	7
Recommendations .....	9

## 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 'Podiatrist' or 'Chiropodist' 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 22 September 2009. At the Committee meeting on 22 September 2009, 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 - programme admissions standards, programme management and resources 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 – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, MSc Podiatry (pre-registration), MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration), MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration), Pg Dip Podiatry (pre-registration), Pg Dip Physiotherapy (pre-registration) and Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (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	Paul Frowen (Podiatrist) Brian Ellis (Podiatrist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	35
Initial approval	29 June 1993
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2009
Chair	Rosalynd Jowett (University of Southampton) Carolyn Blundell Chair for Podiatry meetings (University of Southampton)
Secretary	Sara Dixon (University of Southampton)
Members of the joint panel	Wilfred Foxe (Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists) Alison Hart (Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists)

	Nicola McLarnon (Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists)
--	--

## 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"/>

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 61 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining two 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 did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must redraft and resubmit programme documentation and advertising materials to follow the guidance provided in the HPC 'Regulatory status advertising protocol for education providers'.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. Currently there is reference to the term 'licence to practice' in several documents. This term does not reflect the independence of the HPC or its role as a regulatory body which functions by protecting professional titles. Therefore, in order to provide applicants with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme, the visitors felt the text used in programme documentation and advertising must be amended.

### **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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must redraft and resubmit programme documentation to clearly state the relationship between graduating from the programme and eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted it was clear that the advertising materials for the programme did not fully comply with the advertising guidelines issued by HPC. Specifically, the advertising materials stated that graduates were eligible to register with the HPC. The visitors felt this implied that upon successful completion of the programme graduates could automatically gain registration with the HPC; which is not the case. To enable applicants to make an informed choice about the programme, the visitors' felt the advertising materials must be updated to show that successful completion of an approved programme leads to 'eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC'.

### **6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practice safely and effectively.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide revised documentation to make explicit those elements of the modules that are formative and summative in assessment.

**Reason:** The documentation received by the visitors prior to the visit was not clear and suggested that formative assessment counted towards the summative assessment. During the meeting with the programme team the professional lead for Podiatry explained that the formative assessment was used to guide the

students to know what would be expected of them during the summative assessment for the modules. Therefore it was difficult to determine if the assessments measured the skills required to practice safely and effectively. As this was unclear the visitors would like to receive revised documentation that clearly sets out what the formative assessment for modules will be and what the summative assessment will be.

**6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practice safely and effectively.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide revised documentation to clarify the assessment weightings across all modules within the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation received by the visitors prior to the visit, it was clear that there were inconsistencies in the assessment weightings within the module descriptors for the programme. During the programme team meeting it was discussed how the assessment weightings had been arrived at. The programme team reflected that the weightings might not mirror the student effort across all modules. Therefore the visitors would like to receive documentation that shows equity of student effort across all modules to ensure that the assessments measure the skills to practice safely and effectively.



## Recommendations

### **3.11 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider adopting the proposed attendance model proposed by the university for the revised programme.

**Reason:** The programme team informed the visitors that the system currently in place had perceived weaknesses. However the programme team proposed to introduce the university wide system that ensures attendance is monitored successfully. Whilst the visitors were content that this standard was met, they were happy to support the team in their desire to operate the proposed model for the revised programme.

### **5.8.3 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider formalising the recording of the attendance of practice placement educators at the development sessions.

**Reason:** The visitors were happy that the training of the practice placement educators took place and recognised that the education provider had a database of practice placement educators who had attended the development sessions. However the database currently did not record the date of attendance. The visitors recommended that this date was recorded to enhance the value of the database.

Paul Frowen  
Brian Ellis