

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	London South Bank University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time Part time (In service)
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Date of visit</b>	15 – 17 June 2011

## Contents

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

## 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 15 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. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At the Committee meeting on 13 October 2011 the ongoing approval of the programme was re-confirmed. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, 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 education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – Pg Dip Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography, Pg Dip Therapeutic Radiography, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, DipHE Operating Department Practice and the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice.

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 professional bodies outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Jacqueline Landman (Lay visitor)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	25 (Full time) 17 (Part time) 4 Part time (in service))
First approved intake	1 September 2008
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2011
Chair	Holly Nicholas (London South Bank University)
Secretary	Catherine Moss (London South Bank University)
Members of the joint panel	Lisa Greatrex (Internal Panel Member) Remy Reyes (College of Occupational Therapists) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational

	Therapists) Patricia McClure (College of Occupational Therapists) Clare Taylor (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"/>

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 49 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 8 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 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 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 ensure that the academic entry requirements are consistently stated throughout all programme documentation.

**Reason:** The documentation provided to the visitors prior to the approval visit articulated how academic entry standards were applied to potential applicants and gave an indication of what these standards were. However, in discussion with the senior team it was highlighted that the academic standards stated in the documentation were not those which were being used to determine applicants' suitability for a place on the programme. The visitors also noted that the academic entry standards displayed on the website were different to those stated within the programme documentation. As two different sets of academic standards were stated the visitors were concerned that this could cause confusion to applicants. Therefore, the visitors require the academic entry standards to be consistently and clearly communicated to potential applicants to ensure that they have the information they require to make an informed decision about applying for a place on the programme. In this way the visitors can be sure that any applicant to the programme has the information required to make an informed decision about applying for a place on the programme

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how practice placement settings are monitored to ensure that any resources available to support student learning are effectively used.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements. As the current audit and monitoring processes in place are informal this could lead to perceived inconsistencies in the quality of students' placement experience. In turn this could lead to students successfully appealing assessments associated with their practice placements and graduating from the programme with concerns around their fitness to practice. The visitors therefore require evidence of the formal mechanisms in place that demonstrate that the education provider audits and monitors the resources in practice placement settings to ensure they are appropriate and effectively used. The visitors also require clarification of the criteria used to decide if a practice placement has appropriate resources to support student learning as well as evidence of the supporting protocols that outline the process for dealing with a practice placement that does not meet these criteria.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the resources in practice placement settings are monitored to ensure that the resources support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements. As the current audit and monitoring processes in place are informal this could lead to perceived inconsistencies in the quality of students' placement experience. The visitors therefore require evidence of the formal mechanisms in place that demonstrate that the education provider audits and monitors the resources in practice placement settings to ensure that they support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. The visitors also require clarification of the criteria used to decide if a practice placement has appropriate resources to ensure that they support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme as well as evidence of the supporting protocols that outline the process for dealing with a practice placement that does not meet these criteria.

### **3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the resources in practice placement settings are monitored to ensure that they are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements. As the current audit and monitoring processes in place are informal this could lead to perceived inconsistencies in the quality of students' placement experience. In turn this could lead to students successfully appealing assessments associated with their practice placements and graduating from the programme with concerns around their fitness to practice. The visitors therefore require evidence of the formal mechanisms in place that demonstrate that the education provider audits and monitors the resources, including IT facilities, in practice placement settings to ensure that they are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students. The visitors also require clarification of the criteria used to decide if a practice placement has appropriate and available resources as well as evidence of the supporting protocols that outline the process for dealing with a practice placement that does not meet these criteria.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and outline the process for checking the quality of placements. The education provider must also produce guidelines on their placement requirements, articulating what they consider constitutes a safe and supportive placement environment.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements. As the current audit and monitoring processes in place are informal this could lead to perceived inconsistencies in the quality of students' placement experience. The visitors therefore require further information to demonstrate that the education provider is responsible for placements and the management of placements in the programme. The visitors require further evidence of the auditing process and the guidelines in place to ensure that the education provider can make a judgement on whether placements are of good quality and provide safe and supportive environments.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and outline a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements. The visitors therefore did not have enough evidence that the education provider has a thorough and effective system in place for the approval and monitoring of placements and that the education provider was responsible for the placements in the programme. The visitors require the education provider to provide evidence to demonstrate that there are clear policies and procedures in place around the approval and monitoring of practice placements to ensure that this standard is met.

### **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 in place, implemented and monitored within practice placements.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements.. However, the visitors could find no evidence of a mechanism in place to ensure that practice placements have equality and diversity policies in place and that they are implemented and monitored. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence outlining how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and monitored within practice placements.

**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 outlining how they ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff is in place at the practice placement setting.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements.. However, the visitors require evidence of the formal mechanisms in place that demonstrate that the education provider audits and monitors the staff within the practice placement setting to ensure that they are adequate in number and appropriately qualified and experienced. The visitors also require clarification of the criteria used to decide if a practice placement has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff, as well as evidence of the supporting protocols that outline the process for dealing with a practice placement that does not meet these criteria.

Claire Brewis  
Margaret Curr  
Jacqueline Landman