hpc health professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Date of visit	11-12 February 2010

Contents

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 ongoing approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 8 June 2010. At the Committee meeting on 8 June 2010, 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, practice placements 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 education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of 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 education provider and the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Brendon Edmonds
HPC observer	Benjamin Potter Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	134
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2010
Initial approval	24 June 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Mr Michael Jeffrey
Secretary	Miss Emma Wingate
Members of the joint panel	Nigel Cox (Manchester Metropolitan University) Judith Canham (Manchester Metropolitan University) Rachel McAlpine (Manchester Metropolitan University) Janet Edgar (Manchester Metropolitan University) Katy-Jane Baines (External) Helena Johnson (External) Liz Hancock (Chartered Society of

	Physiotherapists) Ms Nina Thomson (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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐
Assessment Regulations	☒	☐	☐

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and 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 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

2.1 The 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 the programme documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to be registered with the HPC as having a "licence to practice". The visitors also noted the documentation stipulated students must complete 1000 hours on practice placement in order to meet HPC requirements for registration. The HPC do not set a specified number of hours to be completed for placement.

The visitors considered the terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology.

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:

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider stipulated students must complete 1000 hours on practice placement in order to meet HPC requirements for registration. The visitors noted the HPC do not set a specified number of hours to be completed for placement.

The visitors consider the information provided could be misleading to students and therefore require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any reference to the HPC setting a required amount of practice placement hours to be completed.

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 programme documentation to clearly articulate the assessment strategy in place for the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted the programme documentation did not contain specific reference to the assessment strategy governing the assessment for the programme. In particular, the visitors were unclear as to how students were made aware of the rationale underpinning assessment across the three years of the programme. The definitive document included the heading 'assessment strategies' beginning on page xiii. However this describes the assessment methods used, the marking and moderation procedures, and feedback processes.   It does not articulate the underlying strategy or justification for use of the assessment tools, and why the chosen tools will allow students to evidence their achievement of the learning outcomes and how they will enable students to demonstrate their increasing capability as they progress through the programme.

The visitors concluded the programme documentation must clearly articulate the assessment strategy to students. Therefore the visitors require the programme documentation be reviewed accordingly to include the assessment strategy for the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the access students have to library and IT facilities.

Reason: The visitors noted the provision of IT and library facilities available to students on the programme. The visitors also noted the library had reduced opening hours on the weekend. In the meeting with student representatives, the visitors noted some students accessed the alternative campus library at times as this was more accessible for library and IT resources.

The visitors are satisfied the SET is met however recommend the programme team review the current provision of library and IT services to ensure they continue to be readily available for students.

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 including specific reference where appropriate to the HPC guidance on health and character and student conduct and ethics.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation and in meeting with programme team there was a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

The visitors are satisfied the SET is met however recommend the programme team include specific reference where appropriate in the programme documentation to the HPC guidance on health and character and student conduct and ethics to assist this process.

Valerie Maehle
Fleur Kitsell