

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	British Psychological Society
Programme name	Qualification in Counselling Psychology
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Counselling psychologist
Date of visit	3-4 March 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	3
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	17

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 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Counselling psychologist' 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. The education provider has until 20 April 2010 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 20 May 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 8 July 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 16 September 2010.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Practitioner psychologist profession came onto the register in 1 July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. 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.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Liz Holey (Physiotherapist) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Brendon Edmonds
Proposed student numbers	100
Initial approval	1 January 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Martin Eubank (British Psychological Society)
Secretary	Jessica Close (British Psychological Society)
Members of the joint panel	Mark Forshaw (Observer, British Psychological Society) Kathryn Waddington (Observer, British Psychological Society)

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"/>
Assessment Regulations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Professional Practice Guidelines Programme Management structures QCop Website pages Co-ordinator of Training and Supervisor training sessions Enrolment Assessors guidelines Internal validation documentation Equality and Diversity Strategy QAA Subject benchmark statement			
---	--	--	--

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not see the learning resources or specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the qualification does not require any specialist laboratories or 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 programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 38 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 19 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.

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 revisit the programme documentation to more clearly articulate the statutory requirement for Counselling psychologists to be registered with the Health Professions Council.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular it should be made clear throughout all documentation that anyone who wishes to practice using the title Counselling psychologist must be on the HPC register.

The visitors' consider the absence of this information could be potentially misleading to candidates. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation and any advertising material (prospectus, website) to be updated to articulate this requirement.

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 redraft the admissions documentation to clearly articulate the admissions criteria used to assess the entry of potential candidates to the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted the programme documentation articulated the process for admitting potential candidates to the programme. They also noted at the visit the programme team advised they appointed enrolment assessors who were trained to assess applications to the programme. The visitors were not provided with the criteria the assessors use to make judgements about each candidate's qualifications, experience and appropriateness to be admitted to the programme.

The visitors' consider the absence of clear objective criteria does not give 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. The visitors require the programme team to develop objective criteria and a process which requires candidates to clearly map their qualifications and experience against the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs). Criteria must be developed which provides the assessors with a framework with which judgements can be made about a candidate's qualifications and experience. The criteria must be used to determine which SOPs have been met at admission and which SOPs are still to be met through the candidate's progression on the programme.

2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the process for applicants to provide evidence of a criminal conviction check at an enhanced level.

Reason: The visitors noted in the additional documentation submitted prior to the visit the programme team proposed amend the 'Regulations for Society's Postgraduate Qualifications' and 'Candidate Handbook for the Qualification in Counselling Psychology' to articulate the requirement for evidence of an enhanced CRB check at admission. The amendments did not articulate the process to be used to manage any issues arising from this enhanced CRB check.

In order to further evidence how this SET is met, the visitors require the programme documentation to be redrafted to articulate the proposed amendments and to also include a process for managing CRB issues which may arise at the admissions stage and also whilst a candidate is progressing through the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the process for conducting health checks as part of the admissions process.

Reason: The visitors noted in the additional documentation submitted prior to the visit the programme team proposed amend the 'Enrolment Form' to include a process for conducting health checks. The amendments did not articulate the process to be used to manage any issues health related issues at admissions or whilst the candidate was progressing through the programme.

In order to evidence how this SET is met, the visitors require the programme documentation be revisited to articulate the proposed amendments and to also include a process for managing health issues which may arise at the admissions stage and also whilst a candidate is completing the programme. The process must specifically address how applicants with disabilities are assessed and if any disabilities may prevent an applicant from meeting the SOPS during admission to the programme.

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must document the criteria used to assess an applicant's prior learning and experience upon admission to the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and at the visit enrolment assessors were appointed to admit candidates to the programme. The

visitors were not provided with the criteria the enrolment assessors use to make judgements about each candidate's qualifications, experience and appropriateness to be admitted to the programme. In particular the visitors' were not clear as to how applicants eligible for AP(E)L are assessed in relation to the learning outcomes for the programme. The visitors are therefore not satisfied there is a system in place which ensures a candidate is able to demonstrate meeting all the Standards of Proficiency upon successful completion of the programme.

The visitors require the education provider to develop criteria and a process which requires candidates to clearly map their qualifications and experience against the learning outcomes for the programme. Criteria must be developed which provides the assessors with a framework with which judgements can be made about a candidate's qualifications and experience in relation to the learning outcomes. The criteria must be used to determine which learning outcomes have been met at admission and which are still to be met through the candidate's progression on the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the systems in place to effectively manage the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation articulated the programme structure and the various roles which are fulfilled to deliver the programme. At the visit itself, the visitors' met with the programme team, Co-ordinators of Training and Practice Supervisors to further discuss the management of the programme. Although the visitors were satisfied there were adequate numbers of staff and professionals in place to deliver the programme, they were not satisfied that the systems in place adequately supported all aspects of the delivery of the programme.

In particular, the visitors noted there was no system in place to formally and regularly assess the performance of individuals performing in the various roles within the management of the programme. These roles include the Programme Leader, Registrar, Co-ordinators of Training and Placement Supervisors. The visitors also noted there was no system in place for the Registrar and/or Programme leader to maintain regular contact with candidates once they commenced on the programme. Updates on progression were obtained as part of a yearly submission to the education provider and contained reports from the candidate, the practice supervisor and the Coordinator of Training. The visitors also noted the programme had limited formal evaluation of the programme. Feedback was sought through online surveys from students, placement providers and Coordinators of Training. Opportunities for feedback were also made available at training sessions and conferences. Informal feedback could also be submitted at anytime to the programme team by email and phone. The visitors were not satisfied these systems provided adequate opportunities for formal evaluation and feedback.

The visitors therefore require these areas of the management of the programme to be addressed. Further information of these areas are articulated in conditions for SET 3.3, 3.7, 3.12 and 5.4 detailed further on in this report.

3.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the regular monitoring and evaluations systems in place for the programme.

Reason: The visitors evidenced the current systems in place to monitor and evaluate the programme from the documentation provided and also from meetings with various groups at the visit. In particular, the visitors noted candidate, practice supervisor and Coordinator of Training feedback was sought through the completion of online feedback. Furthermore feedback was also sought from Coordinators of Training and Assessors as part of bi-annual and annual training sessions. An External Examiner was also appointed to provide independent assessment of the programme.

In light of these systems the visitors were not satisfied the systems in place provided sufficient evidence of regular monitoring and evaluation of the programme. Furthermore the visitors were not satisfied the systems in place include mechanisms to act on any information gathered. The visitors noted the current systems in place are dependent on candidates, COTs, practice supervisors and assessors engaging with processes. Although useful, the visitors require the education provider to develop regular systems to engage these groups more frequently than on an annual or bi-annual basis. Furthermore, the visitors require further evidence of how information gathered from the current and future systems is consolidated into clear action plans with appropriate timeframes and resources allocated. Further evidence is also required of how any programme enhancements are then communicated to the all involved in completing and progressing on the programme.

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the systems in place to conduct staff appraisals.

Reason: The visitors noted the various roles fulfilled by staff and professionals to deliver the programme. These roles include that of Programme Leader, Registrar, Academic Quality, Coordinator of Training, Practice Supervisor, Enrolment Assessor and Assessor (Assessment). The visitors were also provided with criteria governing the responsibilities and duties to be performed in each role. However, the visitors were not provided with evidence of how individuals are assessed for their performance in these roles.

The visitors were not satisfied adequate systems were in place to assess the performance of individuals in the various roles and therefore were not satisfied this SET is met. The visitors' require further evidence of the systems in place to

conduct regular staff/professional appraisals across all the roles fulfilled on the programme. Any system must articulate how appraisals are conducted, the criteria used to make assessments, the frequency for conducting appraisals and how any issues arising from the appraisals are managed.

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of training provided to new professionals fulfilling roles on the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted the various roles fulfilled by staff and professionals to deliver the programme. These roles include that of Programme leader, Registrar, Academic Quality, Coordinator of Training, Practice Supervisor, Enrolment Assessor and Assessor (Assessment). The visitors were also provided with information regarding on-going training conducted with persons fulfilling these roles. However, the visitors were not provided with training materials used to induct and train newly appointed Enrolment Assessors, Assessors, COTs and Practice Supervisors. Also, no evidence was provided of how training was specifically delivered and the frequency at which this training was delivered throughout the year to these groups.

To be satisfied this SET is met, the visitors require further evidence of the training materials and schedule of training for newly appointed professionals to the roles listed above.

3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the system in place to provide academic and pastoral support to candidates.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and through meetings at the visit itself the academic and pastoral support of the candidate relied heavily on interactions with practice supervisors and the Coordinator of Training. Candidates were only required to meet with their COT twice per year (minimum) and these meetings were at a cost to the candidate. Furthermore, the visitors also noted staff on the programme did not initiate any contact with candidates and relied on yearly reports to monitor progress.

The visitors require further evidence of how the programme team directly support candidates to be satisfied this SET is met. In particular, any evidence should address how the programme team intend to maintain regular contact with candidates as they progress on the programme. Evidence of the nature and frequency of this contact, how records of contact are maintained and how issues from this contact feed into the annual assessment of a candidates' progress should also be articulated.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the complaints process to ensure it can be applied for candidates on placement.

Reason: The visitors noted in the additional documentation submitted prior to the visit, the programme team proposed to amend the complaints procedure to encompass placements settings. Furthermore, the programme team provided a document at the visit itself proposing changes to the Co-ordinator of Training and Supervisor Handbook to include such amendments.

To be satisfied this SET is met, the visitors require further evidence of these amendments being made to the programme documentation where appropriate. Any further evidence will need to ensure these amendments are sufficiently communicated to all parties involved in the placement experience including candidates, Coordinators of Training and Practice Supervisors.

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures the provision of a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the plan of training submitted at the beginning of the programme and subsequently on a yearly basis for update. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the candidate, the placement supervisor and the placement host in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience. The Coordinator of Training is also responsible for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience of the candidate including providing a safe and supportive environment. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures each placement site provide a safe and supportive environment. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit is used to conduct a risk assessment of each placement site, a placement induction and how candidates are made aware about risks and safety issues. An audit tool should also address how a record of these activities is maintained and sent back to the education provider.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the plan of training submitted at the beginning of the programme and subsequently on a yearly basis for update. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the candidate, the placement supervisor and the placement host in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience. The CoT is also responsible for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience of the candidate. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them.

The visitors require further evidence of the system used to approve each placement site and how that tool ensures ongoing monitoring is conducted. In particular any evidence should address how an audit tool is linked to any policies and processes for approving placements, how the audit tool is used to approved the placement site, how the audit tool is used to continually monitor the quality of the placement, how this information is recorded and how any issues arising are managed and inform the development of processes. An audit tool should also address how a record of these activities is maintained and sent back to the education provider.

5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures placement sites have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to candidates.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the plan of training submitted at the beginning of the programme and subsequently on a yearly basis for update. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the candidate, the placement supervisor and the placement host in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience. The CoT is also responsible for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience of the candidate and that appropriate equality and diversity policies are in place. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures each placement site has an equality and diversity policy in place for candidates. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit is used to evidence the presence of such policies together with an indication of how these policies are implemented and monitored at the placement site. The audit tool should also address how a record of these policies is provided to the education provider.

5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures placement sites have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the plan of training submitted at the beginning of the programme and subsequently on a yearly basis for update. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the candidate, the placement supervisor and the placement host in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience. The CoT is also responsible for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience. Furthermore the practice supervisor may not always be employed within the placement environment which the candidate is placed in. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures each placement site has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experience staff. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit is used to assess the provision of staff in accordance with the learning needs of the individual candidate. The audit tool should also address how a record of these assessments is maintained and provided to the education provider.

5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the plan of training submitted at the beginning of the programme and subsequently on a yearly basis. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the candidate, the placement supervisor and the placement host in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience. The CoT is also responsible for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience. Furthermore the practice supervisor may not always be employed within the placement environment which the candidate is placed in. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit is used to assess the

whether placement educators are appropriate to meeting the learning needs of the individual candidate and that they provide a safe environment. The audit tool should also address how a record of these assessments is maintained and provided to the education provider.

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

Condition: The education provider must require practice supervisors to undertake mandatory refresher training sessions.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through meetings at the visit the education provider conducted refresher training sessions for practice supervisors. However these training sessions were not mandatory and therefore not all practice supervisors undertook the refresher training on a regular basis.

In order to be satisfied the SET is met, the visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence articulating the requirement for practice supervisor training to be mandatory. In particular, any evidence submitted should detail how this training is to be conducted, the frequency with which it will be mandatory for practice supervisors to attend and also the implications for supervisors who do not undergo refresher training.

5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the plan of training submitted at the beginning of the programme and subsequently on a yearly basis for update. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the candidate, the placement supervisor and the placement host in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience. The CoT is also responsible for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience. Furthermore the practice supervisor may not always be employed within the placement environment which the candidate is placed in. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures all placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit tool is used to assess the whether placement educators are registered and if not, how they are deemed to be appropriate to provide placement education to the candidate. The

audit tool should also address how a record of these assessments is maintained and provided to the education provider.

5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the systems in place to ensure regular collaboration between the education provider and the placement provider.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, collaboration between the placement sites and the education provider relied heavily upon the role of the CoT and the placement supervisor. At times the placement supervisor may not be placed within the placement site where the candidate is placed. Any communication conducted within these structures was not recorded formally. However, an annual update of training is submitted to the education provider which involves input from the candidate, the CoT and the practice supervisor.

In light of this information, the visitors are not satisfied a system is in place to provide regular, recorded collaboration between the education provider and practice placement environments. Any further evidence should detail how staff on the programme maintain regular contact with placement providers. In particular, the system should detail how contact provides a channel for regular communication directly between the placement site and the education provider to allow for feedback on the candidate's progression or on the programme planning and design. The system should also address how a record of this communication is maintained by education provider and how any issues highlighted from the system are actioned.

6.2 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the assessment criteria to ensure they reflect QAA D-level descriptors.

Reason: The visitors noted the assessment criteria used for the various pieces of assessment on the programme. The visitors deemed the assessment criteria did not reflect the QAA criteria stated for the level of the qualification as articulated in the Candidate Handbook on pg. 5. Furthermore, the candidates indicated in their feedback to the panel they were often unclear of the expected level to be demonstrated when completing pieces of assessment.

The visitors consider the differences between the assessment criteria and the QAA criteria to be potentially confusing for candidates. The visitors require the assessment criteria be revised to more clearly articulate how these relate to the QAA D-level descriptors set for the programme.

6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Condition: The education provider must revise the learning outcomes to ensure they reflect the D-level assessment criteria.

Reason: The visitors noted the learning outcomes set for the eight dimensions of the programme. The visitors deemed the learning outcomes did not reflect the QAA D-level descriptors stated for the level of the qualification as articulated in the Candidate Handbook on pg. 5. Furthermore, the candidates indicated in their feedback to the panel they were often unclear of the level expected to be demonstrated when completing pieces of assessment.

The visitors consider the differences between the learning outcomes and the QAA D-level descriptors to be potentially confusing for candidates and assessors. The visitors require the learning outcomes be revised to more clearly articulate how these relate to the QAA D-level descriptors set for the programme.

6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Condition: The education provider must develop assessment criteria for all pieces of assessment on the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation the assessment criteria listed for each piece of assessment. The visitors deemed the assessment criteria did not sufficiently provide the opportunity for a candidate and assessor to make an objective assessment of work submitted. Furthermore, the visitors deemed the assessment criteria did not sufficiently assess whether a student was fit to practise. In discussions with candidates, the programme team, and the practice placement representatives, it was noted the assessment criteria did not clearly articulate the level at which a candidates work may pass or fail.

The visitors consider the lack of clear, objective assessment criteria to be potentially confusing for candidates and assessors. The visitors require the programme team revisit the programme documentation to develop assessment criteria which clearly articulates an objective assessment of student performance. The assessment criteria must be specific to each piece of assessment for the programme including criteria for the assessment of competencies through the completion of the competency logbook.

Recommendations

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider the appointment of a full time member of staff to further support the management of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted the Registrar was appointed to the programme on a part time basis. Furthermore, they also noted the programme leader was in a voluntary position providing overall management of the programme. The visitors also noted the programme relied heavily on the involvement of professional volunteers to ensure the programme was delivered effectively.

The visitors were satisfied there were sufficient staff in place to deliver the programme. However, the visitors recommend the education provider consider appointing a member of staff on a full time basis to further assist the management of the programme.

3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider making reference to the HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics in any process or guidelines related to students' profession-related conduct.

Reason: The visitors noted the presence of a process to deal with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. Furthermore the visitors noted the process and guidance made reference to the Society's Code of Ethics and Conduct and the DCoP Professional Practice Guidelines.

Although the visitors deem this SET to be met, they recommend the education provider revise the programme documentation to refer to the HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics in any process or guidelines related to dealing with students' profession-related conduct.

4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider developing and delivering more workshops related to assessments on the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from meeting with candidates and the programme team workshops were delivered at key points each year to assist candidates with pieces of assessment. The candidates indicated these workshops were useful in completing and submitting assessment.

The visitors are satisfied this SET is met, however recommend the education provider consider developing the delivery of these workshops to further expand the range of teaching and learning approaches used on the programme. In

particular, the education provider should consider alternative methods for workshop delivery to ensure all candidates can access these.

David Packwood
Liz Holey



The
British
Psychological
Society

48 Princess Road East, Leicester LE1 7DR
Tel: 0116 254 9568 Fax: 0116 227 1314
E-mail: mail@bps.org.uk www.bps.org.uk

Direct line: 0116 252 9505
E-mail: exams@bps.org.uk

Brendon Edmonds
Education Manager (Acting)
Health Professions Council
Park House
184 Kennington Park Road
London SE11 4BU

16 April 2010

Dear Brendon

Draft Report on the Qualification in Counselling Psychology

Thank you for forwarding the draft report regarding the visit to the Society's Qualification in Counselling Psychology.

We have some observations which we would like you to consider before finalising the report.

The report notes that 37 of the SETs have been met but that conditions have been set in relation to 20 SETs. On reading the report we note that more than one condition has been set in relation to some SETs, and as a consequence the body of the report suggests that 38 of the SETs have been met, with conditions set in relation to 19.

In relation to the first condition pertaining to SET 2.1, the report requires us to include wording in the documentation that anyone who wishes to practice as a counselling psychologist must be on the HPC register. Whilst there is no difficulty in amending our documentation to further reflect this, we are unable to find this as a requirement in the SETs or SETs Guidance documentation. In fact the only reference we can find to this is in the advertising guidelines, where a statement is provided for inclusion in the UCAS handbook entry which, as you know, does not apply to our qualification. We would request, therefore, that this particular condition be replaced by a recommendation to the same effect.

In relation to the second condition pertaining to SET 2.1, we wondered whether this condition better reflected the requirements of SET 2.6.

In relation to the condition set for SET 3.2, the discussion suggests we do not have systems in place for the Registrar and/ or Programme Leader to maintain regular contact with candidates once they have commenced on the programme. In fact the Registrar does have bi-monthly contact with all candidates via Emails. It would be helpful, therefore, if the discussion around this SET could be clarified. The report seems to indicate a certain amount of conflation of SETs 3.2, 3.3, 3.7, 3.12 and 5.4 which makes it somewhat confusing to identify which of the comments refer to which of the SETs. It would be helpful to us in meeting these conditions to have a little more clarity around which parts of the discussion refer to which of the SETs.

The discussion around SET 3.7 refers to a position names “Academic Quality.” We do not have a position with this name within our structure, so it would be helpful to clarify which position this refers to.

A particular issue for us pertains to the status of the qualification as a means of enabling work based learning. Whilst the SETs refer to placements, and we have been assured that HPC use this as an umbrella term to cover any form of supervised practice, there appears to be an underlying assumption in the discussion of the SETs around placements that the Society has a number of ‘placement providers’ which it uses on a regular basis. In fact placement is a misnomer when used in the work based learning setting. Our candidates will have jobs during the course of which they gain supervised practice to count towards their qualification. So, whilst it is certainly appropriate for us to take steps to check that the employer is providing an appropriate setting for this supervised practice to take place, our activities in this area need to be proportionate, appropriate to the programme, and to recognise that the employer has a legal responsibility for health and safety issues in the setting. The discussion around these SETs also seems to suggest that approval of these settings should be on an ongoing basis, although the reality is that most will only be used once by one trainee, who may well continue to be employed in that role after qualification. An ongoing audit, therefore, is of limited use once the trainee has completed that particular unit.

Specifically in relation to the conditions set around SETs 5.7 and 5.8 it would be helpful to clarify who the HPC considers to be the placement educator. In our system we have interpreted this as the CoT but the discussion around these SETs does not reflect this understanding, so some clarification would help us to understand what is required to meet the conditions.

Finally, most of the conditions which you have set require fairly small changes to our documentation or the articulation in writing of processes which are in pace. However, some will require some additional changes which will take a little longer. In addition, any changes to our regulations and handbook need to go through an internal approval process before they can be confirmed. For this reason your suggested deadline of 18th May 2010 is a little short for us to meet these conditions and we would like to suggest an alternative of 8th July 2010. This would allow 6 weeks before the meeting of your Education and Training Committee scheduled for 16/17th September 2010 and we hope this will be acceptable to you.

We are happy for this response to be published on your website alongside your report.

With best wishes.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Pamela E. James." The signature is written in a cursive style and is underlined with a single horizontal line.

Professor Pam James

Chair, Board of Assessors in Counselling Psychology

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time and Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	4–5 February 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	10

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 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational therapist' 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. The education provider has until 2 April 2010 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 20 May 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 4 June 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 26 August 2010.

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 and assessment. 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 professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. 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 the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Jane Grant (Occupational Therapist) Margaret Foster (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
HPC observer	Brendon Edmonds
Proposed student numbers	56 Full time 20 Part time
Initial approval	9 January 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	21 September 2010
Chair	Liz Coldridge (University of Salford)
Secretary	Clare Wolstenholme (University of Salford)
Members of the joint panel	Clair Parkin (College of Occupational Therapists) Jennifer Caldwell (College of Occupational Therapists) Jill Jepson (College of Occupational Therapists)

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"/>
Supporting placement information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supporting strategic and operational reports	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supporting education provider policy documents	<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 programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 45 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 12 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 recommendation 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 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 update the admissions documentation and all programme documentation to ensure there is specific reference to the programme leading to eligibility to apply for registration, including the implications of registration, and to ensure the language used throughout reflects HPC terminology.

Reason: The admissions material provided for this programme did not highlight the fact that the programme leads to eligibility to apply to our Register and the implications of registration. The documentation provided also refers to the programme leading to a “licence to practise”. The visitors considered the omission and the incorrect terminology meant potential applicants were not receiving enough information to be able to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on the programme and students were been given wrong information. The visitors therefore require the education provider to update all programme documentation including admissions materials to ensure this standard is met.

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must update the admissions documentation to ensure the English level requirement on entry to the programme is clearly specified consistently across all materials.

Reason: The admissions documents provided made clear reference to the English level requirement in some places but not in all of the programme documentation. The visitors felt this was potentially confusing for applicants and therefore require the education provider to ensure the English level requirements are consistently referenced throughout the programme documentation.

3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The education provider must revise the documentation to ensure the correct standard is referred to when stating the consent procedures are an HPC requirement.

Reason: The documentation provided made clear references to the requirement of a consent procedure. The HPC standard which the education provider linked to this requirement was incorrect. The visitors require this to be corrected to avoid confusion for students and programme staff. Therefore the visitors require the documentation to be updated.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition: The education provider must amend the programme documentation to ensure specific reference to the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics are used and are correct in its reference wherever it is appropriate.

Reason: The documentation provided by the education provider made no explicit reference to the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics in the module descriptors. The programme documentation made it evident that conduct was an integral aspect of the taught curriculum but the specific HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics were not referred to in the reading lists or module learning outcomes. The programme documentation did state that the HPC requires students to demonstrate developing professionalism so as to comply with our "Professional Code of Conduct". The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to make specific references to the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics and to ensure the correct title is also used wherever it is appropriate.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide additional evidence of the process for approving and monitoring overseas placements.

Reason: Through discussions at the visit it became clear that there were processes in place for approving and monitoring overseas placements which were not detailed in the documentation provided. The visitors felt it was important that the placements abroad be effectively approved and monitored to ensure that the overseas placement environments are suitable for students. In particular the visitors were aware that the final PP6 placement module could be taken abroad and being the final placement for consideration of fitness to practice this could pose problems with equality issues, supervisor experience, the quality of supervision, opportunities for the student to demonstrate fitness to practise alongside potential language difficulties. The visitors therefore require evidence of the full approval processes and how they are monitored.

5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure equality and diversity policies are implemented and monitored within overseas practice placements.

Reason: Through discussions at the visit it became clear that there were processes in place for any overseas placements which were not detailed in the documentation provided. The visitors felt it was important that the placements abroad have equality and diversity policies which ensure that the overseas placement environments are suitable for students. The visitors therefore require

evidence of how the education provider makes sure the overseas placements have equality and diversity policies and are implemented and monitored.

5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff within overseas practice placements.

Reason: Through discussions at the visit it became clear that there were processes in place for any overseas placements which were not detailed in the documentation provided. The visitors felt it was important that the placements abroad have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff which ensures the overseas placement environments are suitable for students. The visitors therefore require evidence of how the education provider makes sure the overseas placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience within overseas practice placements.

Reason: Through discussions at the visit it became clear that there were processes in place for the overseas placements which were not detailed in the documentation provided. The visitors felt it was important the practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience which ensure the overseas placement environments are suitable for students. The visitors therefore require evidence of how the education provider makes sure the overseas practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure practice placement educators have undertaken the appropriate practice placement educator training within non-traditional overseas practice placements.

Reason: Through discussions at the visit it became clear that there were processes for approving and monitoring overseas placements which were not detailed in the documentation provided. The visitors expect the practice placement educators to have undertaken the appropriate training to ensure the quality of supervision given and therefore ensuring overseas placement environments are suitable for students. The visitors therefore require evidence of how the education provider makes sure the overseas practice placement educators have undertaken the appropriate practice placement educator training.

5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The education provider must ensure the requirement to have appropriately registered practice placement educators, unless other arrangements are agreed, is included within the practice placement documentation.

Reason: The practice placement handbook provided had a statement to the effect that students would be “supervised by a registered occupational therapist.” The visitors deemed this was not explicit enough to ensure this SET is met. The visitors require it to be made clearer for the students that the practice placement educators will be registered with the HPC or have agreed other arrangements including the non-traditional overseas placements that may be used by students during the final PP6 placement.

6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of the mechanisms in place for the effective monitoring and evaluations which ensure there are appropriate standards in the assessment within non-traditional overseas placements.

Reason: Through documentation provided and discussions at the visit it was evident there were processes in place for the effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment but it was not clear how the overseas placement assessments were similarly monitored and evaluated. The visitors expect the assessments of the placements abroad be monitored and evaluated to ensure the assessments are appropriate to ensure fitness to practise at the end of the final 10 week placement (PP6). Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit evidence of the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place for the overseas placements.

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 clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register or propose alternative arrangements.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy for the programme visited. The visitors were happy with the current external examiner arrangements for the programme but need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Recommendations

3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation: The visitors wished to support the firm commitment made by the senior staff to keep to the current renovation plans and have the new teaching room ready for the start of the next academic year by 31 August 2010.

Reason: From discussions with the students and the tour of facilities there was some concern around the current limitations of the room currently used. The students in particular described the room as being of “dire” condition and this was confirmed during the tour. The renovation plans as described by the senior team set a firm date by which the room would be ready for students. In later discussions with the programme team they seemed unaware of this date. The visitors were satisfied that currently the resources to support student learning meet the threshold level for this standard. Therefore the visitors wish to support the commitment made for the renovation plans at all education provider levels.

Jane Grant
Margaret Foster

Observations on Health Professions Council (HPC) Visitors' Report following re-approval visit to the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy – 4-5th February 2010

In accordance with the HPC guidance the University would like to submit the following observations on the HPC visitors' report.

1. Page 9, paragraph 2

“The visitors require it to be made clearer for the students that the practice placement educators will be registered with the HPC or have agreed other arrangements including **the non-traditional overseas placements that may be used by students during the final PP6 placement**”.

Observation

The programme does not allow students to do an **overseas non-traditional placement**. The non-traditional placement occurs at the beginning of level 6 and is PP5. A small number of students may choose to do an ERASMUS exchange at this point instead of a non-traditional placement; they will undertake a **traditional** placement in the visiting country.

2. Page 9, paragraph 3

“The education provider must provide evidence of the mechanisms in place for the effective monitoring and evaluations which ensure there are appropriate standards in the assessment within **non-traditional overseas placements**”.

Observation

The programme does not allow students to do an **overseas non-traditional placement**. A small number of students may choose to do an ERASMUS exchange instead of a non-traditional placement and will undertake a traditional placement in the visiting country.

3. Page 6, Conditions

The team has reviewed the documentation originally submitted to the HPC as evidence and will update to ensure the conditions are met. The revised documentation will be submitted to the HPC by the agreed deadline of 4th June 2010.

4. Page 10, Recommendations

The Faculty has agreed the deadline of 30th August 2010 with the staff team for the renovation of the new teaching room. Feedback from the students and staff on this will be monitored via the University's Annual Quality Monitoring and Enhancement reports.

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme name	Pg Dip Rehabilitation (Occupational Therapy)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	3 – 4 March 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	16

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 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational therapist' 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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 27 April 2010 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 20 May 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 10 August 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 16 September 2010.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC 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 reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MSc Rehabilitation (Occupational Therapy), Pg Dip Rehabilitation (Physiotherapy) and MSc Rehabilitation (Physiotherapy).

The education provider, the professional bodies 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	Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist) Bernadette Waters (Occupational Therapy)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
HPC observer	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	10 students per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2010
Chair	Judith Porch (Teesside University)
Secretary	John Holmes (Teesside University)
Members of the joint panel	Paul Taylor (Internal Panel Member) Fiona Terry (Internal Panel Member) Kelly Sisson (Internal Panel Member) Marion Grieves (Internal Panel Member) Gillian Naylor (Internal Panel Member) Alison Bullock (External Panel Member) John Simpson (External Panel Member) Remy Reyes (College of Occupational

	Therapists) Patricia McClure (College of Occupational Therapists) Karen Morris (College of Occupational Therapists) Anna Clampin (College of Occupational Therapists)
--	--

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review the external examiners reports prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

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"/>

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) and the MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 36 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 20 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for 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 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 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 revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that it clearly addresses the exact nature of the programme, the mode of study, the programme funding, the practical implications for dual registration and to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation submitted showed inconsistencies and did not give students a coherent explanation of the nature of the programme, the mode of study and the funding options available to them.

The visitors require that the documentation is reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology. In particular the visitors noted that the documentation stipulated that 1000 hours of practice are required for statutory regulation with the HPC. The HPC do not set a specified number of hours to be completed for placement, therefore this needs to be clearly stated as a professional body requirement to prevent any confusion.

From a review of the documentation it was not made clear to applicants the implications that dual registration would have, in that dual registration would require students to apply to separate registers, pay two charges and maintain separate records of continual professional development (CPD). This information should be clearly stated within the programme documentation so that applicants have all the information they require to make an informed choice about the programme.

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) entry criteria are clear. The education provider must also ensure that the acronym IELTS is correctly stated within the documentation.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted it was apparent that the IELTS level on entry to the programme was level 6. At the visit, discussions with the programme team indicated that this should read level 7. The visitors felt that an IELTS score of 7 was appropriate as the education provider also stipulated that one of the entry criteria was that applicants needed to be on the relevant part of the Register. Any student who has been on the Register would have already demonstrated the necessary level of English for the standards of proficiency for their profession. The visitors also noted that on a number of occasions the acronym IELTS was stated as ILETS. The visitors require further evidence to

demonstrate that the programme documentation clearly states the IELTS level on entry to the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions at the visit the visitors noted that the current programme documentation did not give a clear indication of the entry criteria and the academic and professional entry standards required. In particular it was not always clear whether HPC registration was needed to apply to the programme, which qualifications would be considered on application and whether the programme was open to both new graduates and experienced applicants from the profession. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that this standard is met.

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the minimum number of students that are needed to run the programme, clearly outlining the resource provision for these students and the funding arrangements for the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions at the visit the funding arrangements for the programme were not clear. In particular it was not apparent if the programme would be self funded by students. The visitors also require clarification regarding the student cohort numbers per year and how the programme will be resourced with regards to staff and facilities, given the number of occupational therapy programmes delivered by the education provider. From the meetings with the programme team and senior staff the visitors did not receive full confirmation regarding the minimum number of students needed to run the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure this standard is being met.

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 clarify the number of staff in place to deliver the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not fully determine how the programme will be resourced in terms of staff, particularly given the number of other occupational therapy programmes delivered by the education provider. The visitors require further evidence regarding how the programme will be effectively delivered, to include details of staff allocated to the programme and whether the staff are full or part time members of the programme team, in order

to ensure that there are an appropriate number of staff to deliver an effective programme.

3.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the staff in place to deliver the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not fully determine how the programme will be resourced in terms of staff, particularly given the number of other occupational therapy programmes delivered by the education provider. The visitors require further evidence regarding how the programme will be effectively delivered. This information should include details of the staff allocated to the programme and whether the staff are full or part time members of the programme team, in order to ensure that the programme is taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver an effective programme.

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the process that is in place to support the programme team in their development to achieving a doctorate level qualification.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions at the visit the visitors could not determine whether members of the programme team had or were working towards doctorate level qualifications. The visitors noted that the education provider had been running masters level programmes for several years and the expectation would be that staff would be working towards a higher level qualification. The visitors require further evidence regarding the current arrangements and ongoing training that is in place for members of the programme team to achieve this level qualification.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the learning outcomes and module descriptors to clearly demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that the standards of proficiency are addressed within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly link the successful attainment of the standards of proficiency to the learning outcomes within the module descriptors as these were broad and generic. From the information provided the visitors were concerned about the balance between the generic skills and the profession specific skills required, as the time allocated to profession specific skills and contact hours appeared

extremely limited in the programme. The visitors also noted that the delivery of a large number of the learning outcomes was expected to fall to the practice placement educators. Furthermore, from information received at the visit, it was apparent that the module descriptors had been developed further since the documentation was submitted.

Therefore the visitors require further evidence in the form of revised module descriptors that clearly articulate where the standards of proficiency are addressed and delivered in the programme to ensure those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners. This evidence should also demonstrate how the education provider ensures the delivery of the learning outcomes attributed to practice placement educators.

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly outline how theory and practice are integrated in both the theoretical and practical parts of the programme.

Reason: From the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were unable to clearly determine how theory and practice were integrated in the programme and how this was informed through the design of the programme. This was due to the learning outcomes and the module descriptors provided being broad and generic. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

4.6 The delivery of the programme must support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate how the programme develops autonomous and reflective thinking.

Reason: From the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were unable to clearly determine how the design of the programme supports and develops autonomous and reflective thinking. This was due to the learning outcomes and the module descriptors provided being broad and generic. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

4.7 The delivery of the programme must encourage evidence based practice.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate how evidence based practice is encouraged within the programme delivery.

Reason: From the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were unable to clearly determine how the design of the programme encourages evidence based practice. This was due to the

learning outcomes and the module descriptors provided being broad and generic. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the module descriptors to clearly demonstrate that the learning and teaching approaches ensure that all appropriate learning outcomes are addressed within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly determine the range of learning and teaching approaches used in the programme and how these ensured the delivery of the learning outcomes required to ensure a safe and effective practitioner. It was not always clear how the modules throughout the programme would be delivered. This was due to the learning outcomes and the module descriptors provided being broad and generic. From the information provided the visitors were also concerned about the balance between the delivery of generic skills and the profession specific skills required, as the time allocated to profession specific skills and contact hours appeared extremely limited in the programme. The visitors also noted that the delivery of a large number of these learning outcomes was expected to fall to the practice placement educators.

Therefore the visitors require further evidence in the form of revised module descriptors that clearly articulate the learning and teaching approaches for each module. This evidence should also demonstrate how the education provider ensures the delivery of the learning outcomes attributed to practice placement educators.

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Condition: The education provider must clarify how they ensure that profession specific skills are protected given the high level of interprofessional learning built into the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit and discussions with the programme team it was apparent that there was a large amount of interprofessional learning within the programme. The visitors were concerned that the level of interprofessional learning built into the programme could compromise the unique professional components of each profession. The visitors therefore require evidence that clarifies how the profession specific skills are protected in the programme.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the placement arrangements for the programme.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit there were limited details regarding the status of the placement organisation for the programme. Due to this the visitors could not determine the number and range of placements that had been secured for students to attend. The visitors require clarification of the plans in place to identify placements for the programme. This evidence should demonstrate the placement numbers available in order to show the placement availability for students on the programme.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the time students spend on placement to demonstrate that students have sufficient time to develop profession specific skills in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions at the visit it was clear that the total duration of placements in the programme was shorter compared to the MSc Rehabilitation (Physiotherapy) programme. The visitors noted that the students on this programme would be required to complete a written assessment rather than participating in a similar period of placement experience than the MSc Rehabilitation (Physiotherapy) students. The visitors require further evidence to confirm that the total placement duration ensures students have enough time to develop their profession specific skills on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate the plans to ensure that practice placement educators receive appropriate programme specific training.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team and placement providers it was not clear if there were arrangements in place for preparing practice placement educators to supervise students on the programme. These plans included training the placement educators on the programme requirements and finalising the documentation to be utilised by placement educators.

The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates the plans for delivering programme specific training to practice placement educators, the details of the commencement dates of this training and the content of the planned training.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- the learning outcomes to be achieved;
- the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;
- expectations of professional conduct;
- the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and
- communication and lines of responsibility.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate how students and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placements in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the clinical handbook for the students and practice placement educators the visitors noted that it was not always clear how the learning outcomes demonstrated that standards of proficiency were being met in the programme, and therefore did not clearly communicate these requirements to students, practice placement educators and the education provider. This was due to the learning outcomes and the module descriptors provided being broad and generic. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the learning outcomes and module descriptors to clearly demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that the standards of proficiency are assessed within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly link the successful attainment of the standards of proficiency to the learning outcomes within the module descriptors as these were broad and generic. The visitors also noted that the summative assessment of a large number of the learning outcomes was expected to fall to the practice placement educators after formative assessments were carried out in the education provider setting. From a review of the information provided there was also a concern that students could take different pathways through the programme in both education provider and practice placement settings. The visitors did not receive clarification of how the education provider monitors the student route through the programme to ensure that the focus is not on specific specialties and therefore risking the scenario where all standards of proficiency are not met.

Therefore the visitors require further evidence in the form of revised module descriptors that clearly articulate where the standards of proficiency are assessed in the programme to ensure those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners. The visitors require further evidence that the link

between formative assessments in the education provider setting and summative assessment on placements ensures all the standards of proficiency are met. This evidence should also demonstrate how the education provider ensures the content validity across the summative assessments and details of the overview mechanism that is in place to ensure that all the standards of proficiency are assessed despite different pathways through the programme.

6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly demonstrate how the assessment methods ensure that the standards of proficiency are assessed within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly link the successful attainment of the standards of proficiency to the learning outcomes within the module descriptors as these were broad and generic. The visitors also noted that the summative assessment of a large number of the learning outcomes was expected to fall to the practice placement educators after formative assessments were carried out in the education provider setting. From a review of the information provided there was also a concern that students could take different pathways through the programme in both education provider and practice placement settings. The visitors did not receive clarification of how the education provider monitors the student route through the programme to ensure that the focus is not on specific specialties and therefore risking the scenario where all standards of proficiency are not met.

Therefore the visitors require further evidence in the form of revised module descriptors that clearly articulate where the standards of proficiency are assessed in the programme to ensure those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners. The visitors require further evidence that the link between formative assessments in the education provider setting and summative assessment on placements ensures all the standards of proficiency are met. This evidence should also demonstrate how the education provider ensures the content validity across the summative assessment and an overview mechanism is in place to ensure that all the standards of proficiency are assessed despite different pathways through the programme.

6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly demonstrate how the measurement of student performance is objective within the programme and ensures fitness to practice.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly link the successful attainment of the standards of proficiency to the learning outcomes within the module descriptors as these were broad and generic. The visitors also noted that the summative assessment of a large number of the learning outcomes was expected to fall to the practice placement

educators after formative assessments were carried out in the education provider setting. From a review of the information provided there was also a concern that students could take different pathways through the programme in both education provider and practice placement settings. The visitors did not receive clarification of how the education provider monitors the student route through the programme to ensure that the focus is not on specific specialties and therefore risking the scenario where all standards of proficiency are not met.

Therefore the visitors require further evidence in the form of revised module descriptors that clearly articulate where the standards of proficiency are assessed in the programme to ensure those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners. The visitors require further evidence that the link between formative assessments in the education provider setting and summative assessments on placements ensures all the standards of proficiency are met. This evidence should also demonstrate how the education provider ensures the content validity across the summative assessment and an overview mechanism is in place to ensure that all the standards of proficiency are assessed despite different pathways through the programme.

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 clarify the arrangements for the external examiner for this programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was not clear what arrangements were in place regarding an external examiner for this programme. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the arrangements in place to ensure that this standard is being met.

Recommendations

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendation: The visitors wished to recommend that the education provider should consider including the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics in the reading list for the module descriptors.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors were happy that the requirements of HPC regarding conduct, performance and ethics were delivered to students in the programme. The visitors felt that the students would benefit from being directed towards the HPC publication by including the Standards of conduct, performance and ethics in the module descriptor reading lists.

6.3 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting.

Recommendation: The visitors wished to recommend that the education provider should consider exploring the idea of developing a placement assessment tool based around competencies specific to the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions at the visit it was apparent that the education provider was using an existing assessment tool on placements that is used on the other occupational therapy programmes delivered at the education provider. The visitors noted that during the meeting with the practice placement educators they suggested that a new programme specific competency based assessment tool could be developed. The visitors would like to recommend that the education provider consider adjusting the assessment tool in this way and that they explore this possibility further with practice placement educators.

Bernadette Waters
Joanna Jackson

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme name	MSc Rehabilitation (Occupational Therapy)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	3 – 4 March 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	16

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 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational therapist' 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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 27 April 2010 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 20 May 2010, at this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 10 August 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 16 September 2010.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC 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 reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – Pg Dip Rehabilitation (Occupational Therapy), Pg Dip Rehabilitation (Physiotherapy) and MSc Rehabilitation (Physiotherapy).

The education provider, the professional bodies 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	Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist) Bernadette Waters (Occupational Therapy)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
HPC observer	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	10 students per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2010
Chair	Judith Porch (Teesside University)
Secretary	John Holmes (Teesside University)
Members of the joint panel	Paul Taylor (Internal Panel Member) Fiona Terry (Internal Panel Member) Kelly Sisson (Internal Panel Member) Marion Grieves (Internal Panel Member) Gillian Naylor (Internal Panel Member) Alison Bullock (External Panel Member) John Simpson (External Panel Member) Remy Reyes (College of Occupational

	Therapists) Patricia McClure (College of Occupational Therapists) Karen Morris (College of Occupational Therapists) Anna Clampin (College of Occupational Therapists)
--	--

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review the external examiners reports prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

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"/>

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) and the MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 36 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 20 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for 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 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 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 revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that it clearly addresses the exact nature of the programme, the mode of study, the programme funding, the practical implications for dual registration and to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation submitted showed inconsistencies and did not give students a coherent explanation of the nature of the programme, the mode of study and the funding options available to them.

The visitors require that the documentation is reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology. In particular the visitors noted that the documentation stipulated that 1000 hours of practice are required for statutory regulation with the HPC. The HPC do not set a specified number of hours to be completed for placement, therefore this needs to be clearly stated as a professional body requirement to prevent any confusion.

From a review of the documentation it was not made clear to applicants the implications that dual registration would have, in that dual registration would require students to apply to separate registers, pay two charges and maintain separate records of continual professional development (CPD). This information should be clearly stated within the programme documentation so that applicants have all the information they require to make an informed choice about the programme.

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) entry criteria are clear. The education provider must also ensure that the acronym IELTS is correctly stated within the documentation.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted it was apparent that the IELTS level on entry to the programme was level 6. At the visit, discussions with the programme team indicated that this should read level 7. The visitors felt that an IELTS score of 7 was appropriate as the education provider also stipulated that one of the entry criteria was that applicants needed to be on the relevant part of the Register. Any student who has been on the Register would have already demonstrated the necessary level of English for the standards of proficiency for their profession. The visitors also noted that on a number of occasions the acronym IELTS was stated as ILETS. The visitors require further evidence to

demonstrate that the programme documentation clearly states the IELTS level on entry to the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions at the visit the visitors noted that the current programme documentation did not give a clear indication of the entry criteria and the academic and professional entry standards required. In particular it was not always clear whether HPC registration was needed to apply to the programme, which qualifications would be considered on application and whether the programme was open to both new graduates and experienced applicants from the profession. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that this standard is met.

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the minimum number of students that are needed to run the programme, clearly outlining the resource provision for these students and the funding arrangements for the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions at the visit the funding arrangements for the programme were not clear. In particular it was not apparent if the programme would be self funded by students. The visitors also require clarification regarding the student cohort numbers per year and how the programme will be resourced with regards to staff and facilities, given the number of occupational therapy programmes delivered by the education provider. From the meetings with the programme team and senior staff the visitors did not receive full confirmation regarding the minimum number of students needed to run the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure this standard is being met.

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 clarify the number of staff in place to deliver the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not fully determine how the programme will be resourced in terms of staff, particularly given the number of other occupational therapy programmes delivered by the education provider. The visitors require further evidence regarding how the programme will be effectively delivered, to include details of staff allocated to the programme and whether the staff are full or part time members of the programme team, in order

to ensure that there are an appropriate number of staff to deliver an effective programme.

3.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the staff in place to deliver the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not fully determine how the programme will be resourced in terms of staff, particularly given the number of other occupational therapy programmes delivered by the education provider. The visitors require further evidence regarding how the programme will be effectively delivered. This information should include details of the staff allocated to the programme and whether the staff are full or part time members of the programme team, in order to ensure that the programme is taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver an effective programme.

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the process that is in place to support the programme team in their development to achieving a doctorate level qualification.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions at the visit the visitors could not determine whether members of the programme team had or were working towards doctorate level qualifications. The visitors noted that the education provider had been running masters level programmes for several years and the expectation would be that staff would be working towards a higher level qualification. The visitors require further evidence regarding the current arrangements and ongoing training that is in place for members of the programme team to achieve this level qualification.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the learning outcomes and module descriptors to clearly demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that the standards of proficiency are addressed within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly link the successful attainment of the standards of proficiency to the learning outcomes within the module descriptors as these were broad and generic. From the information provided the visitors were concerned about the balance between the generic skills and the profession specific skills required, as the time allocated to profession specific skills and contact hours appeared

extremely limited in the programme. The visitors also noted that the delivery of a large number of the learning outcomes was expected to fall to the practice placement educators. Furthermore, from information received at the visit, it was apparent that the module descriptors had been developed further since the documentation was submitted.

Therefore the visitors require further evidence in the form of revised module descriptors that clearly articulate where the standards of proficiency are addressed and delivered in the programme to ensure those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners. This evidence should also demonstrate how the education provider ensures the delivery of the learning outcomes attributed to practice placement educators.

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly outline how theory and practice are integrated in both the theoretical and practical parts of the programme.

Reason: From the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were unable to clearly determine how theory and practice were integrated in the programme and how this was informed through the design of the programme. This was due to the learning outcomes and the module descriptors provided being broad and generic. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

4.6 The delivery of the programme must support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate how the programme develops autonomous and reflective thinking.

Reason: From the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were unable to clearly determine how the design of the programme supports and develops autonomous and reflective thinking. This was due to the learning outcomes and the module descriptors provided being broad and generic. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

4.7 The delivery of the programme must encourage evidence based practice.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate how evidence based practice is encouraged within the programme delivery.

Reason: From the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were unable to clearly determine how the design of the programme encourages evidence based practice. This was due to the

learning outcomes and the module descriptors provided being broad and generic. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the module descriptors to clearly demonstrate that the learning and teaching approaches ensure that all appropriate learning outcomes are addressed within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly determine the range of learning and teaching approaches used in the programme and how these ensured the delivery of the learning outcomes required to ensure a safe and effective practitioner. It was not always clear how the modules throughout the programme would be delivered. This was due to the learning outcomes and the module descriptors provided being broad and generic. From the information provided the visitors were also concerned about the balance between the delivery of generic skills and the profession specific skills required, as the time allocated to profession specific skills and contact hours appeared extremely limited in the programme. The visitors also noted that the delivery of a large number of these learning outcomes was expected to fall to the practice placement educators.

Therefore the visitors require further evidence in the form of revised module descriptors that clearly articulate the learning and teaching approaches for each module. This evidence should also demonstrate how the education provider ensures the delivery of the learning outcomes attributed to practice placement educators.

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Condition: The education provider must clarify how they ensure that profession specific skills are protected given the high level of interprofessional learning built into the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit and discussions with the programme team it was apparent that there was a large amount of interprofessional learning within the programme. The visitors were concerned that the level of interprofessional learning built into the programme could compromise the unique professional components of each profession. The visitors therefore require evidence that clarifies how the profession specific skills are protected in the programme.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the placement arrangements for the programme.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit there were limited details regarding the status of the placement organisation for the programme. Due to this the visitors could not determine the number and range of placements that had been secured for students to attend. The visitors require clarification of the plans in place to identify placements for the programme. This evidence should demonstrate the placement numbers available in order to show the placement availability for students on the programme.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the time students spend on placement to demonstrate that students have sufficient time to develop profession specific skills in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions at the visit it was clear that the total duration of placements in the programme was shorter compared to the MSc Rehabilitation (Physiotherapy) programme. The visitors noted that the students on this programme would be required to complete a written assessment rather than participating in a similar period of placement experience than the MSc Rehabilitation (Physiotherapy) students. The visitors require further evidence to confirm that the total placement duration ensures students have enough time to develop their profession specific skills on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate the plans to ensure that practice placement educators receive appropriate programme specific training.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team and placement providers it was not clear if there were arrangements in place for preparing practice placement educators to supervise students on the programme. These plans included training the placement educators on the programme requirements and finalising the documentation to be utilised by placement educators.

The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates the plans for delivering programme specific training to practice placement educators, the details of the commencement dates of this training and the content of the planned training.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- the learning outcomes to be achieved;
- the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;
- expectations of professional conduct;
- the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and
- communication and lines of responsibility.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate how students and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placements in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the clinical handbook for the students and practice placement educators the visitors noted that it was not always clear how the learning outcomes demonstrated that standards of proficiency were being met in the programme, and therefore did not clearly communicate these requirements to students, practice placement educators and the education provider. This was due to the learning outcomes and the module descriptors provided being broad and generic. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the learning outcomes and module descriptors to clearly demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that the standards of proficiency are assessed within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly link the successful attainment of the standards of proficiency to the learning outcomes within the module descriptors as these were broad and generic. The visitors also noted that the summative assessment of a large number of the learning outcomes was expected to fall to the practice placement educators after formative assessments were carried out in the education provider setting. From a review of the information provided there was also a concern that students could take different pathways through the programme in both education provider and practice placement settings. The visitors did not receive clarification of how the education provider monitors the student route through the programme to ensure that the focus is not on specific specialties and therefore risking the scenario where all standards of proficiency are not met.

Therefore the visitors require further evidence in the form of revised module descriptors that clearly articulate where the standards of proficiency are assessed in the programme to ensure those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners. The visitors require further evidence that the link

between formative assessments in the education provider setting and summative assessment on placements ensures all the standards of proficiency are met. This evidence should also demonstrate how the education provider ensures the content validity across the summative assessments and details of the overview mechanism that is in place to ensure that all the standards of proficiency are assessed despite different pathways through the programme.

6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly demonstrate how the assessment methods ensure that the standards of proficiency are assessed within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly link the successful attainment of the standards of proficiency to the learning outcomes within the module descriptors as these were broad and generic. The visitors also noted that the summative assessment of a large number of the learning outcomes was expected to fall to the practice placement educators after formative assessments were carried out in the education provider setting. From a review of the information provided there was also a concern that students could take different pathways through the programme in both education provider and practice placement settings. The visitors did not receive clarification of how the education provider monitors the student route through the programme to ensure that the focus is not on specific specialties and therefore risking the scenario where all standards of proficiency are not met.

Therefore the visitors require further evidence in the form of revised module descriptors that clearly articulate where the standards of proficiency are assessed in the programme to ensure those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners. The visitors require further evidence that the link between formative assessments in the education provider setting and summative assessment on placements ensures all the standards of proficiency are met. This evidence should also demonstrate how the education provider ensures the content validity across the summative assessment and an overview mechanism is in place to ensure that all the standards of proficiency are assessed despite different pathways through the programme.

6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly demonstrate how the measurement of student performance is objective within the programme and ensures fitness to practice.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly link the successful attainment of the standards of proficiency to the learning outcomes within the module descriptors as these were broad and generic. The visitors also noted that the summative assessment of a large number of the learning outcomes was expected to fall to the practice placement

educators after formative assessments were carried out in the education provider setting. From a review of the information provided there was also a concern that students could take different pathways through the programme in both education provider and practice placement settings. The visitors did not receive clarification of how the education provider monitors the student route through the programme to ensure that the focus is not on specific specialties and therefore risking the scenario where all standards of proficiency are not met.

Therefore the visitors require further evidence in the form of revised module descriptors that clearly articulate where the standards of proficiency are assessed in the programme to ensure those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners. The visitors require further evidence that the link between formative assessments in the education provider setting and summative assessments on placements ensures all the standards of proficiency are met. This evidence should also demonstrate how the education provider ensures the content validity across the summative assessment and an overview mechanism is in place to ensure that all the standards of proficiency are assessed despite different pathways through the programme.

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 clarify the arrangements for the external examiner for this programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was not clear what arrangements were in place regarding an external examiner for this programme. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the arrangements in place to ensure that this standard is being met.

Recommendations

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendation: The visitors wished to recommend that the education provider should consider including the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics in the reading list for the module descriptors.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors were happy that the requirements of HPC regarding conduct, performance and ethics were delivered to students in the programme. The visitors felt that the students would benefit from being directed towards the HPC publication by including the Standards of conduct, performance and ethics in the module descriptor reading lists.

6.3 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting.

Recommendation: The visitors wished to recommend that the education provider should consider exploring the idea of developing a placement assessment tool based around competencies specific to the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions at the visit it was apparent that the education provider was using an existing assessment tool on placements that is used on the other occupational therapy programmes delivered at the education provider. The visitors noted that during the meeting with the practice placement educators they suggested that a new programme specific competency based assessment tool could be developed. The visitors would like to recommend that the education provider consider adjusting the assessment tool in this way and that they explore this possibility further with practice placement educators.

Bernadette Waters
Joanna Jackson

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme name	Pg Dip Rehabilitation (Physiotherapy)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	3 – 4 March 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	16

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 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' or 'Physical therapist' 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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 27 April 2010 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 20 May 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 10 August 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 16 September 2010.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC 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 reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MSc Rehabilitation (Occupational Therapy), Pg Dip Rehabilitation (Occupational Therapy) and MSc Rehabilitation (Physiotherapy).

The education provider, the professional bodies 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	Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist) Bernadette Waters (Occupational Therapy)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Paula Lescott
HPC observer	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	10 students per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2010
Chair	Judith Porch (Teesside University)
Secretary	John Holmes (Teesside University)
Members of the joint panel	Paul Taylor (Internal Panel Member) Fiona Terry (Internal Panel Member) Kelly Sisson (Internal Panel Member) Marion Grieves (Internal Panel Member) Gillian Naylor (Internal Panel Member) Alison Bullock (External Panel Member) John Simpson (External Panel Member) Remy Reyes (College of Occupational

	Therapists) Patricia McClure (College of Occupational Therapists) Karen Morris (College of Occupational Therapists) Nina Thompson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Sara Eastburn (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)
--	---

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review the external examiners reports prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

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"/>

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) and the MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 36 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 20 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for 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 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 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 revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that it clearly addresses the exact nature of the programme, the mode of study, the programme funding, the practical implications for dual registration and to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation submitted showed inconsistencies and did not give students a coherent explanation of the nature of the programme, the mode of study and the funding options available to them.

The visitors require that the documentation is reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology. In particular the visitors noted that the documentation stipulated that 1000 hours of practice are required for statutory regulation with the HPC. The HPC do not set a specified number of hours to be completed for placement, therefore this needs to be clearly stated as a professional body requirement to prevent any confusion.

From a review of the documentation it was not made clear to applicants the implications that dual registration would have, in that dual registration would require students to apply to separate registers, pay two charges and maintain separate records of continual professional development (CPD). This information should be clearly stated within the programme documentation so that applicants have all the information they require to make an informed choice about the programme.

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) entry criteria are clear. The education provider must also ensure that the acronym IELTS is correctly stated within the documentation.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted it was apparent that the IELTS level on entry to the programme was level 6. At the visit, discussions with the programme team indicated that this should read level 7. The visitors felt that an IELTS score of 7 was appropriate as the education provider also stipulated that one of the entry criteria was that applicants needed to be on the relevant part of the Register. Any student who has been on the Register would have already demonstrated the necessary level of English for the standards of proficiency for their profession. The visitors also noted that on a number of occasions the acronym IELTS was stated as ILETS. The visitors require further evidence to

demonstrate that the programme documentation clearly states the IELTS level on entry to the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions at the visit the visitors noted that the current programme documentation did not give a clear indication of the entry criteria and the academic and professional entry standards required. In particular it was not always clear whether HPC registration was needed to apply to the programme, which qualifications would be considered on application and whether the programme was open to both new graduates and experienced applicants from the profession. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that this standard is met.

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the minimum number of students that are needed to run the programme, clearly outlining the resource provision for these students and the funding arrangements for the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions at the visit the funding arrangements for the programme were not clear. In particular it was not apparent if the programme would be self funded by students. The visitors also require clarification regarding the student cohort numbers per year and how the programme will be resourced with regards to staff and facilities, given the number of occupational therapy programmes delivered by the education provider. From the meetings with the programme team and senior staff the visitors did not receive full confirmation regarding the minimum number of students needed to run the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure this standard is being met.

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 clarify the number of staff in place to deliver the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not fully determine how the programme will be resourced in terms of staff, particularly given the number of other occupational therapy programmes delivered by the education provider. The visitors require further evidence regarding how the programme will be effectively delivered, to include details of staff allocated to the programme and whether the staff are full or part time members of the programme team, in order

to ensure that there are an appropriate number of staff to deliver an effective programme.

3.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the staff in place to deliver the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not fully determine how the programme will be resourced in terms of staff, particularly given the number of other occupational therapy programmes delivered by the education provider. The visitors require further evidence regarding how the programme will be effectively delivered. This information should include details of the staff allocated to the programme and whether the staff are full or part time members of the programme team, in order to ensure that the programme is taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver an effective programme.

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the process that is in place to support the programme team in their development to achieving a doctorate level qualification.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions at the visit the visitors could not determine whether members of the programme team had or were working towards doctorate level qualifications. The visitors noted that the education provider had been running masters level programmes for several years and the expectation would be that staff would be working towards a higher level qualification. The visitors require further evidence regarding the current arrangements and ongoing training that is in place for members of the programme team to achieve this level qualification.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the learning outcomes and module descriptors to clearly demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that the standards of proficiency are addressed within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly link the successful attainment of the standards of proficiency to the learning outcomes within the module descriptors as these were broad and generic. From the information provided the visitors were concerned about the balance between the generic skills and the profession specific skills required, as the time allocated to profession specific skills and contact hours appeared

extremely limited in the programme. The visitors also noted that the delivery of a large number of the learning outcomes was expected to fall to the practice placement educators. Furthermore, from information received at the visit, it was apparent that the module descriptors had been developed further since the documentation was submitted.

Therefore the visitors require further evidence in the form of revised module descriptors that clearly articulate where the standards of proficiency are addressed and delivered in the programme to ensure those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners. This evidence should also demonstrate how the education provider ensures the delivery of the learning outcomes attributed to practice placement educators.

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly outline how theory and practice are integrated in both the theoretical and practical parts of the programme.

Reason: From the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were unable to clearly determine how theory and practice were integrated in the programme and how this was informed through the design of the programme. This was due to the learning outcomes and the module descriptors provided being broad and generic. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

4.6 The delivery of the programme must support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate how the programme develops autonomous and reflective thinking.

Reason: From the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were unable to clearly determine how the design of the programme supports and develops autonomous and reflective thinking. This was due to the learning outcomes and the module descriptors provided being broad and generic. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

4.7 The delivery of the programme must encourage evidence based practice.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate how evidence based practice is encouraged within the programme delivery.

Reason: From the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were unable to clearly determine how the design of the programme encourages evidence based practice. This was due to the

learning outcomes and the module descriptors provided being broad and generic. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the module descriptors to clearly demonstrate that the learning and teaching approaches ensure that all appropriate learning outcomes are addressed within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly determine the range of learning and teaching approaches used in the programme and how these ensured the delivery of the learning outcomes required to ensure a safe and effective practitioner. It was not always clear how the modules throughout the programme would be delivered. This was due to the learning outcomes and the module descriptors provided being broad and generic. From the information provided the visitors were also concerned about the balance between the delivery of generic skills and the profession specific skills required, as the time allocated to profession specific skills and contact hours appeared extremely limited in the programme. The visitors also noted that the delivery of a large number of these learning outcomes was expected to fall to the practice placement educators.

Therefore the visitors require further evidence in the form of revised module descriptors that clearly articulate the learning and teaching approaches for each module. This evidence should also demonstrate how the education provider ensures the delivery of the learning outcomes attributed to practice placement educators.

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Condition: The education provider must clarify how they ensure that profession specific skills are protected given the high level of interprofessional learning built into the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit and discussions with the programme team it was apparent that there was a large amount of interprofessional learning within the programme. The visitors were concerned that the level of interprofessional learning built into the programme could compromise the unique professional components of each profession. The visitors therefore require evidence that clarifies how the profession specific skills are protected in the programme.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the placement arrangements for the programme.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit there were limited details regarding the status of the placement organisation for the programme. Due to this the visitors could not determine the number and range of placements that had been secured for students to attend. The visitors require clarification of the plans in place to identify placements for the programme. This evidence should demonstrate the placement numbers available in order to show the placement availability for students on the programme.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate the range of placements that students are required to complete on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions at the visit it was not clear what range of placements students need to complete on the programme to ensure that they gain the necessary skills and range of experience for the profession. The visitors require further evidence to confirm that the range of placement experience and core client groups are ensured on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate the plans to ensure that practice placement educators receive appropriate programme specific training.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team and placement providers it was not clear if there were arrangements in place for preparing practice placement educators to supervise students on the programme. These plans included training the placement educators on the programme requirements and finalising the documentation to be utilised by placement educators.

The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates the plans for delivering programme specific training to practice placement educators, the details of the commencement dates of this training and the content of the planned training.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to demonstrate how students and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placements in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the clinical handbook for the students and practice placement educators the visitors noted that it was not always clear how the learning outcomes demonstrated that standards of proficiency were being met in the programme, and therefore did not clearly communicate these requirements to students, practice placement educators and the education provider. This was due to the learning outcomes and the module descriptors provided being broad and generic. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the learning outcomes and module descriptors to clearly demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that the standards of proficiency are assessed within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly link the successful attainment of the standards of proficiency to the learning outcomes within the module descriptors as these were broad and generic. The visitors also noted that the summative assessment of a large number of the learning outcomes was expected to fall to the practice placement educators after formative assessments were carried out in the education provider setting. From a review of the information provided there was also a concern that students could take different pathways through the programme in both education provider and practice placement settings. The visitors did not receive clarification of how the education provider monitors the student route through the programme to ensure that the focus is not on specific specialties and therefore risking the scenario where all standards of proficiency are not met.

Therefore the visitors require further evidence in the form of revised module descriptors that clearly articulate where the standards of proficiency are assessed in the programme to ensure those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners. The visitors require further evidence that the link between formative assessments in the education provider setting and summative assessment on placements ensures all the standards of proficiency are met. This evidence should also demonstrate how the education provider ensures the content validity across the summative assessments and details of the overview

mechanism that is in place to ensure that all the standards of proficiency are assessed despite different pathways through the programme.

6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly demonstrate how the assessment methods ensure that the standards of proficiency are assessed within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly link the successful attainment of the standards of proficiency to the learning outcomes within the module descriptors as these were broad and generic. The visitors also noted that the summative assessment of a large number of the learning outcomes was expected to fall to the practice placement educators after formative assessments were carried out in the education provider setting. From a review of the information provided there was also a concern that students could take different pathways through the programme in both education provider and practice placement settings. The visitors did not receive clarification of how the education provider monitors the student route through the programme to ensure that the focus is not on specific specialties and therefore risking the scenario where all standards of proficiency are not met.

Therefore the visitors require further evidence in the form of revised module descriptors that clearly articulate where the standards of proficiency are assessed in the programme to ensure those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners. The visitors require further evidence that the link between formative assessments in the education provider setting and summative assessment on placements ensures all the standards of proficiency are met. This evidence should also demonstrate how the education provider ensures the content validity across the summative assessment and an overview mechanism is in place to ensure that all the standards of proficiency are assessed despite different pathways through the programme.

6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly demonstrate how the measurement of student performance is objective within the programme and ensures fitness to practice.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly link the successful attainment of the standards of proficiency to the learning outcomes within the module descriptors as these were broad and generic. The visitors also noted that the summative assessment of a large number of the learning outcomes was expected to fall to the practice placement educators after formative assessments were carried out in the education provider setting. From a review of the information provided there was also a concern that students could take different pathways through the programme in both education provider and practice placement settings. The visitors did not receive clarification

of how the education provider monitors the student route through the programme to ensure that the focus is not on specific specialties and therefore risking the scenario where all standards of proficiency are not met.

Therefore the visitors require further evidence in the form of revised module descriptors that clearly articulate where the standards of proficiency are assessed in the programme to ensure those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners. The visitors require further evidence that the link between formative assessments in the education provider setting and summative assessments on placements ensures all the standards of proficiency are met. This evidence should also demonstrate how the education provider ensures the content validity across the summative assessment and an overview mechanism is in place to ensure that all the standards of proficiency are assessed despite different pathways through the programme.

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 clarify the arrangements for the external examiner for this programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted it was not clear what arrangements were in place regarding an external examiner for this programme. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the arrangements in place to ensure that this standard is being met.

Recommendations

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendation: The visitors wished to recommend that the education provider should consider including the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics in the reading list for the module descriptors.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors were happy that the requirements of HPC regarding conduct, performance and ethics were delivered to students in the programme. The visitors felt that the students would benefit from being directed towards the HPC publication by including the Standards of conduct, performance and ethics in the module descriptor reading lists.

6.3 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting.

Recommendation: The visitors wished to recommend that the education provider should consider exploring the idea of developing a placement assessment tool based around competencies specific to the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions at the visit it was apparent that the education provider was using an existing assessment tool on placements that is used on the other occupational therapy programmes delivered at the education provider. The visitors noted that during the meeting with the practice placement educators they suggested that a new programme specific competency based assessment tool could be developed. The visitors would like to recommend that the education provider consider adjusting the assessment tool in this way and that they explore this possibility further with practice placement educators.

Bernadette Waters
Joanna Jackson

EP - Teesside University
Programmes - MSc Rehabilitation (Physiotherapy), MSc Rehabilitation
(Occupational Therapy), PgDip (Physiotherapy), PgDip (Occupational
Therapy)
Visit date – 03 - 04 March 2010

Overall, we thank you for clear and objective reports which are clearly explained. We do however have two comments to make:

1) MSc Rehabilitation (physiotherapy) SET 3.6 mention of 'other occupational therapy programmes...'. We assume this is meant to read 'other physiotherapy programmes..'

2) In relation to all the programmes, SET 3.7: The SET states that 'a programme for staff development must be in place to endure continuing professional and research development'. However, the condition specifically relates to the programme teams reaching doctorate level. We understand that this specific and prescriptive requirement is not documented in HPC SETs, has not been raised in other recent HPC approvals of M level provision we are aware of and is therefore somewhat inconsistent. We believe that the expectations of specific achievements of individuals should be left with the University, in relation to local arrangements for supervising M level projects. At Teesside, this supervision team is wider than the teaching team, as it involves career researchers. PhDs do not prepare for teaching and assessment at M level, but do support the dissertation supervision. Thus, we believe it is important that qualifications and experience needed to run the programme should be considered on a whole team basis as the requirements are more complex than requiring each person to hold a PhD. We therefore request that the HPC reword this condition, to more closely match the wording of the SET.

We are happy that the reports become available in the public domain.