

HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Education provider | Bournemouth University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time |
| Approval visit date | 4 – 6 September 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-11743-P9J4W1 |

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 4 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 5 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 6 |
| Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation | 11 |
| Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)..... | 11 |

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 6 of this report.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------------|
| Susanne Roff | Lay |
| Anthony Power | Physiotherapist |
| Jennifer Caldwell | Occupational therapist |
| John Archibald | HCPC executive |
| Tamara Wasylec | HCPC executive (observer) |

Other groups involved in the approval visit

This was a multi-professional visit with four HCPC panels:

- Panel 1 - Diploma of Higher Education and BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice; BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioners
- Panel 2 - PG Dip Social Work, MA Social Work and BA (Hons) Social Work
- Panel 3 - PG Dip Social Work (Children and Families) and MA Social Work (Children and Families)
- Panel 4 – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy

For the paramedic programme there were representatives from the professional body, College of Paramedics. For the physiotherapy and occupational therapy programmes there were representatives from their respective professional bodies, Chartered Society

of Physiotherapy and Royal College of Occupational Therapists. For each profession assessed at this multi-professional event there were representatives from the education provider and the external panel members from their relevant professions. Outlined below are the details of the other groups in attendance at the approval visit. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

| Internal panel members | | |
|--|--|---|
| Angelos Stefanidis | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | Bournemouth University (paramedic and operating department practice panel) |
| Julia Evans | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | Bournemouth University |
| Maxine Frampton | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | Bournemouth University |
| Fiona Cownie | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | Bournemouth University (social work panel) |
| Jack Guymer | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | Bournemouth University (social work children and families panel) |
| Andy Guttridge | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | Bournemouth University (Occupational therapy and physiotherapy) |
| External panel members | | |
| Roger King | External panel member | University of West London—operating department practice |
| Lee Price | External panel member | University of Brighton – occupational therapy |
| Karin Crawford | External panel member | University of Lincoln – social work |
| Helen Frank | External panel member | University of Worcester – physiotherapy |
| Professional body panel members | | |
| Vince Clarke | Professional body representative | College of Paramedics – Representative |
| Chris Moat | Professional body representative | College of Paramedics – Representative |
| Helen Frank | Professional body representative | Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Representative |
| Nina Paterson | Professional body representative | Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Education advisor |
| Shan Aguilar-Stone | Professional body representative | Chartered Society of Physiotherapy – Professional advisor |
| Vanessa Parmenter | Professional body representative | Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Representative |

| | | |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| Patricia McClure | Professional body representative | Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Representative |
| Maureen Sheila | Professional body representative | Royal College of Occupational Therapists – Education officer |
| HPCP MA and BA Social work panel members | | |
| Dorothy Smith | Social worker | HPCP visitor |
| Kate Johnson | Social worker | HPCP visitor |
| Manoj Mistry | Lay | HPCP visitor |
| Eloise O'Connell | HPCP executive | HPCP – Social work panel lead |
| HPCP MA / PG Dip Social work (Children and Families) | | |
| Diane Whitlock | Lay | HPCP visitor |
| Robert Goeman | Social worker | HPCP visitor |
| David Childs | Social worker | HPCP visitor |
| HPCP occupational therapy and physiotherapy panel members | | |
| Jennifer Caldwell | Occupational therapist | HPCP visitor |
| Anthony Power | Physiotherapist | HPCP visitor |
| Susanne Roff | Lay | HPCP visitor |
| John Archibald | HPCP executive | HPCP –occupational therapy and physiotherapy panel lead |
| Tamara Wasylec | HPCP executive | Observer |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2005 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 35 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP01672 |

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment. The education provider advised the HCPC it intended to review the programme with the view to making a major overhaul of curriculum and assessment to update the inter-professional learning for the programmes. The programme is also moving to new facilities from September 2019.

| | |
|----------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2005 |

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 35 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP01673 |

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment. The education provider advised the HCPC it intended to review the programme with the view to making a major overhaul of curriculum and assessment to update the inter-professional learning for the programmes. The programme is also moving to new facilities from September 2019.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation | Submitted |
|---|-----------|
| Programme specification | Yes |
| Module descriptor(s) | Yes |
| Handbook for learners | Yes |
| Handbook for practice based learning | Yes |
| Completed education standards mapping document | Yes |
| Completed proficiency standards mapping document | Yes |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | Yes |
| External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable | Yes |

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

| Group | Met |
|---|-----|
| Learners | Yes |
| Senior staff | Yes |
| Practice education providers | Yes |
| Service users and carers (and / or their representatives) | Yes |
| Programme team | Yes |
| Facilities and resources | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 07 December 2018.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the process in place for identifying and appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for both programmes is appropriate.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the curriculum vitae of the current programme leader. From the documentation and discussions with the senior team, the visitors were aware of the individuals who will have overall professional responsibility for the programmes. The visitors noted that the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced and, on the relevant part of the Register. In the senior team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors were informed that this process includes a 'mentoring system', sending out an expression of interest and that there are a set of prescribed qualifications and particular criteria including HCPC registration for undertaking the role. However, the visitors were not provided with the documented process, and therefore could not determine that it is appropriate to ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process for ensuring that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Condition: For the physiotherapy programme, the education provider must demonstrate the system used to initially approve and ensure the quality of practice-based learning in role emerging environments is thorough and effective.

Reason: In a review of the documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood there is a practice-based learning audit process in place. In discussions with the programme team and the practice educators, the visitors heard all practice-based learning settings are audited using the same system. They heard the education provider instigates the re-audit process every three years. The visitors were satisfied the current audit process is effective in approving traditional practice-based learning environments. These environments are normally situated within larger organisations (for example, NHS Trusts), where there are established governance arrangements around the provision of suitable placements, and they usually involve registered physiotherapists in direct supervision and oversight of learners.

However, the visitors were not satisfied that this same audit system is effective to ensure role emerging practice-based learning environments provide suitable opportunities for learners. In particular, the visitors noted these environments could be placed within smaller settings, with no direct supervision or oversight input from registered physiotherapists. Additionally, they also noted such environments may not have the same experience in providing appropriate support and governance to the provision of practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the system used to initially approve and ensure the quality of practice-based learning in role emerging environments and how the education provider ensures it is thorough and effective.

5.4 Practice-based learning must take place in an environment that is safe and supportive for learners and service users.

Condition: For the physiotherapy programme, the education provider must demonstrate the system used to initially approve practice-based learning in role emerging environments ensures the environment is safe and supportive for learners and service users.

Reason: In a review of the documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood there is a practice-based learning audit process in place. In discussions with the programme team and the practice educators, the visitors heard all practice-based learning settings are audited using the same system. They heard the education provider instigates the re-audit process every three years. The visitors were satisfied the current audit process is effective in approving traditional practice-based learning environments. These environments are normally situated within larger organisations (for example, NHS Trusts), where there are established governance arrangements around the provision of suitable placements, and they usually involve registered physiotherapists in direct supervision and oversight of learners.

However, the visitors were not satisfied that this same audit system is effective to ensure role emerging practice-based learning environments are suitable and support safe and effective learning. In particular, the visitors noted these environments could be placed within smaller settings, with no direct supervision or oversight input from registered physiotherapists. Additionally, they also noted such environments may not have the same experience in providing appropriate support and governance to the provision of practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require further evidence of

the system used to initially approve practice-based learning in role emerging environments, and how the education provider ensures it is a safe and supportive environment for learners and service users.

5.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Condition: For the physiotherapy programme, the education provider must demonstrate the system used to initially approve practice-based learning in role emerging environments ensures there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Reason: In a review of the documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood there is a practice-based learning audit process in place. In discussions with the programme team and the practice educators, the visitors heard all practice-based learning settings are audited using the same system. They heard the education provider instigates the re-audit process every three years. The visitors were satisfied the current audit process is effective in approving traditional practice-based learning environments. These environments are normally situated within larger organisations (for example, NHS Trusts), where there are established governance arrangements around the provision of suitable placements, and they usually involve registered physiotherapists in direct supervision and oversight of learners.

However, the visitors were not satisfied that this same audit system is effective to ensure there is enough support for learners to take part in safe and effective practice-based learning in role emerging practice-based learning settings. In particular, the visitors noted these environments could be placed within smaller settings, with no direct supervision or oversight input from registered physiotherapists. Additionally, they also noted such environments may not have the same experience in providing appropriate support and governance to the provision of practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the system used to initially approve practice-based learning in role emerging environments, and how the education provider ensures an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff are involved in practice-based learning.

5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: For the physiotherapy programme, the education provider must demonstrate the system used to initially approve practice-based learning in role emerging environments ensures practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood there is a practice-based learning audit process in place. In discussions with the programme team and the practice educators, the visitors heard all practice-based learning settings are audited using the same system. They heard the education provider instigates the re-audit process every three years. The visitors were satisfied the current audit process is effective in approving traditional practice-based learning environments. These environments are normally situated within larger organisations (for example,

NHS Trusts), where there are established governance arrangements around the provision of suitable placements, and they usually involve registered physiotherapists in direct supervision and oversight of learners.

However, the visitors were not satisfied that this same audit system is effective to ensure practice educators are suitable and are able to support and develop learners in a safe and effective way. In particular, the visitors noted these environments could be placed within smaller settings, with no direct supervisory or oversight input from registered physiotherapists. Additionally, they also noted such environments may not have the same experience in providing appropriate support and governance to the provision of practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the system used to initially approve and ensure the quality of practice-based learning in role emerging environments ensures practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Condition: For the physiotherapy programme, the education provider must demonstrate how practice educators in role emerging practice-based learning environments undertake regular training appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Reason: In a review of the documentation the visitors were made aware new practice educators attend the education provider's practice placement educator training course. The visitors were made aware those practice educators who had received training at any education provider were recommended to attend an update every two years. From discussions at the visit with the practice educators and the programme team, the visitors understood practice educators in role emerging practice-based learning environments are also invited to receive training.

Based on these findings, the visitors were not clear how the education provider ensures practice educators in role emerging practice-based learning environments, where the practice-based educator may not be from the relevant part of the Register, undertake regular training so they are appropriately prepared to support learning and assess learners effectively. In particular, the visitors noted these environments could be placed within smaller settings, with no direct supervisory or oversight input from registered physiotherapists. Additionally, they also noted such environments may not have the same experience in providing appropriate support and governance to the provision of practice-based learning. The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures practice educators in role emerging environments undertake regular training appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Recommendations

We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

3.5 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.

Recommendation: The education provider should explore a wider range of methods of maintaining collaboration between themselves and practice education providers across both programmes.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware of various methods of communication between the education provider and the practice education providers. The documentation explained the physiotherapy programme team consults with practice education providers to discuss any issues related to placement learning. The visitors were informed there are regular update events for occupational therapy practice education providers throughout the academic year. In the meeting with practice educators however, the visitors were told by some practice educators they felt uninformed of the process of change to the programmes. Some practice educators conversely said they were essentially told by the education provider of the changes to the programmes.

From the review of these communication methods the visitors were satisfied this standard was met. However, they recommended the education provider should consider further how they work in partnership with those who provide practice-based learning and should explore a wider range of methods of maintaining regular and effective collaboration between themselves and practice education providers.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Recommendation: For the physiotherapy programme, the education provider should increase efforts for a more diverse range of placements.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were informed that at the moment most practice-based learning is based in NHS practice-based learning settings. The documentation stated they currently have provision for placements away from the National Health Service (NHS) in the private sector and within the Ministry of Defence. The programme team informed the visitors they have had a small number of role-emerging placements but these were not currently sustainable.

From the review of the placements, the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met. However, the visitors recommend the education provider continue with their efforts to offer practice-based learning experiences in non-NHS practice-based learning settings.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The education provider should review the reading lists of modules to ensure the programme reflects current practice.

Reason: On review of the documentation provided and discussions with the programme team at the visit, the visitors noted the reading lists for the modules were becoming dated. In the programme team meeting the visitors were told the programme team would look at the lists. Whilst the visitors were satisfied the standard was met, they recommend the education provider revisit the reading lists for modules and bring

them more up-to-date, to ensure appropriate and effective resources were referenced and available to support learning.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Recommendation: The education provider should explore other opportunities for how learners are prepared to work with other professionals and across professions.

Reason: From the review of the documentation and in discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed the process of learning and working together with and from other relevant professionals (inter-professional Education (IPE)) was through a research-based unit. The programme team said there was no treatment-based IPE unit. The programme team said they had inter-professional theme days but these were separate to the research-based unit and consisted more of a case-based study exercise. From the evidence provided, the visitors were satisfied the standard was met. However, the visitors recommend the education provider look into other opportunities for learning with and from professionals and learners from other relevant professions so inter-professional education is as relevant as possible for learners and is of the most benefit for their future professional practice and for service users and carers.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 30 January 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to this section at this time, but should consider whether to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future.

From a review of the documentation and the tour of the facilities, the visitors were satisfied the current resources available to learners and educators are used effectively to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programmes. However, the education provider informed us at the visit that the programmes will be moving to a new building in 2020. This may affect the programme's ability to meet the standards relating to programme resources. Therefore the education provider should notify us of this change by submitting a change notification form closer to the time when the changes will take effect.