

Visitors' report

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Name of education provider | University of Cumbria |
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of HPC register | Physiotherapy |
| Date of visit | 15 and 16 January 2008 |

Contents

| | |
|------------------------------|----------|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction | 2 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence..... | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 4 |
| Conditions | 5 |
| Recommendations | 5 |

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 13 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 on 26 March 2008. At the Education and Training Committee's meeting on 29 May 2008, 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 programme admissions standards, programme management and resources standards, curriculum standards, practice placements standards and assessment standards. 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 | Professor Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Mr Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) |
| HPC executive officer (in attendance) | Mandy Hargood |
| HPC observer | Paula Lescott |
| Proposed student numbers | 20 |
| Initial approval | 9 January 2003 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2008 |
| Chair | Dr Hugh Cutler University of Cumbria |
| Secretary | Caron Jackson University of Cumbria |
| Members of the joint panel | Dr Pam Bagley University of Cumbria External Panel Member/Chartered Society of Physiotherapists Tim Barry University of Cumbria Internal Panel Member Dr Joanna Jackson University of Cumbria External Panel Member/ Chartered Society of Physiotherapists Lois Mansfield University of Cumbria Internal Panel Member Nina Thompson, Quality Assurance Officer for 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 | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Descriptions of the modules | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The HPC did not review external examiners reports prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit them. However, they did table them at the visit itself.

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 | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Learning resources | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | X | <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.

A condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 62 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 1 SET.

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.

Conditions

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The education provider must redraft and resubmit documentation to make reference HPC's Standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: Currently the documentation makes reference to the professional body documentation relating to conduct performance and ethics but there was no reference to the HPC publication. Students need to read this documentation in order to know what will be expected of them once they have graduated and attained registration with the HPC.

Recommendations

5.5 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider widening the range of non traditional physiotherapy placement areas.

Reason: The visitors felt that there was a good opportunity for the programme team to investigate the possibility of non traditional physiotherapy placements within the Carlisle area.

Professor Valerie Maehle
Mr Anthony Power