

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	1 – 3 March 2017

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2017. At the Committee meeting on 12 June 2017, the ongoing approval of the programme was re-confirmed. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional bodies considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and BA (Hons) in Social Work. The education provider, the professional bodies and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist) Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer) Simon Mudie (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Rebecca Stent (Lead executive for the Diagnostic Radiography/ Occupational Therapy panel) Tamara Wasylec (Lead executive for the Social Work panel)
Proposed student numbers	70 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
First approved intake	September 2000
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	Heather McLaughlin (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Secretary	Alison Geargeoura (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Members of the joint panel	Kene Igweonu (Internal Panel Member) Helen Carey (External Panel Member) Alison Coates (Quality and Standards Representative) David Bennett (Learning and Teaching representative)

	<p>Alexandra Telekova (Student panel member)</p> <p>Dr Ruth Heames (College of Occupational Therapists)</p> <p>Dr Janice Jones (College of Occupational Therapists)</p> <p>Anne Longmore (College of Occupational Therapists)</p> <p>Maureen Shiells (College of Occupational Therapists)</p>
--	---

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be satisfied that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

Condition: The programme team must revisit programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider contained inaccuracies in relation to HCPC regulation. For example, on page 36 of the programme specification there is the following statement: “In accordance with WFOT, COT and HCPC requirements the programme management of the Occupational Therapy programme will be by a registered occupational therapist with a minimum of six years post registered professional experience and three years in higher education.” Furthermore, at the top of the student consent form for students to participate as service users in practical sessions, it is specified that this is an “HCPC requirement”. However, the HCPC does not set a requirement for the level and type of experience that programme leaders must have and does not stipulate that a consent form specifically must be used to obtain a student’s consent to act as a service user. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that it is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC so that the resources to support student learning in all settings will be effectively used.

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 provide further evidence to demonstrate that, where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols will be used to obtain their consent.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to a consent form which students sign at the beginning of the programme. However, in discussions with the students at the visit, students were unclear about when they were participating as service users in the current programme and they did not recall when or how they gave their consent to participate in these sessions. Therefore, the visitors were not satisfied that students will be able to give their informed consent to participate in these sessions as service users throughout the programme and that students will be clear about the sessions where they can opt out. As such, the visitors require further evidence about the protocols in place to ensure that students are giving their informed consent when they participate as service users in practical sessions and that they are clear about when they can opt out.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that they have identified the attendance requirements at the academic setting including how this will be monitored and communicated to students so that any issues with attendance can be dealt with consistently by the education provider.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the university wide policy for attendance at the academic setting supplied in the student handbook which stipulates that all teaching sessions are “compulsory”. However, in discussions with the programme team and students, there were differing statements about the actual attendance requirements and whether attendance is always monitored and recorded for each taught session. The programme team stated that they say all sessions are mandatory so that students are encouraged to attend all sessions but that there is not a 100 per cent attendance requirement due to sickness and other circumstances. In addition, the programme team stated that attendance will be monitored in the new programme with an electronic card system which students will use to record their attendance. It was not clear from these discussions what the attendance requirements were for the programme and what the consequences of missed attendance would be when attendance falls below a certain point and, therefore, how any issues with attendance are dealt with consistently by the education provider. In addition, it was not clear from the documentation for students how attendance will be recorded in the new programme and how students are clear about attendance requirements and the consequences of falling below this requirement. As such, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the programme documentation will be used to ensure that students are clear about the attendance requirements at the academic setting, the consequences of falling below this requirement, how the education provider will deal with any attendance issues consistently and how attendance will be 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 further evidence to demonstrate that they ensure that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the educational audit form used by the education provider for approving and monitoring practice placements. At the visit, the programme team stated that they would expect this policy to be considered within the audit. However, from this document, the visitors could not see how this document is being used to ensure that all placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place. The visitors noted that this could be a particular issue for placements at private providers which are less likely to have these policies in place. As such, the visitors require further evidence as to how the education provider will utilise this audit tool to ensure that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

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

Condition: The programme team must clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme in relation to reassessments for both the academic and practice elements, and how this information will be communicated accurately and consistently to students.

Reason: In documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted on page 39 of the placement handbook that “students will be offered a reassessment opportunity.”

However, at the programme team meeting for the Paramedic Science programme, it was confirmed that all programmes will have two reassessment opportunities at each level of the programme for both the academic and practice element of the programme. As such, the visitors are currently unclear about the reassessment opportunities for students if they fail an academic or practice element in this programme. Therefore, the programme team must provide further evidence to clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme in relation to reassessments for both the academic and practice elements, and how this information will be communicated consistently and accurately to students.

Angela Ariu
Shaaron Pratt
Simon Mudie