

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Part time and Full time accelerated
Relevant part of HPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	23-24 March 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 17 May 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 8 June 2010 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 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 8 June 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 - programme admissions and programme management and resources. 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 and validating reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) (Full time), Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) (Full time) and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Full time). 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 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	Sarah Johnson (Occupational Therapist) Laura Graham (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	15
Initial approval	September 2006
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	Part time - September 2010 Full time accelerated – last graduation July 2010
Chair	Nigel South (University of Essex)
Secretary	Kirstie Sceats (University of Essex)
Members of the joint panel	Remy Reyes (College of Occupational Therapists) Claire Brewis (College of Occupational Therapists) Auldeen Alsop (College of Occupational Therapists) Timothy Dennis (Internal Panel Member)

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"/>
Resources Document	<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 ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 47 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 10 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

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate the systems that are in place to manage the programme effectively.

Reason: From the programme documentation provided prior to the visit the information regarding evidence of regular monitoring and evaluation systems was not clear. Discussions at the visit revealed the programme was subject to regular monitoring and evaluation systems. The visitors were satisfied the programme had regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place which were not fully explained in the documentation provided. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the monitoring and evaluation systems in place (clarifications of the groups and committees involved at the programme level with details of what they do) to demonstrate the systems are in place and manage the programme effectively.

3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must submit information regarding the named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme and provide their CV.

Reason: Discussions at the visit indicated there would be a change to the named programme leader provided in the documentation. Discussions revealed the named person would not be continuing in the position as programme leader for this programme and would be replaced by a new member of staff to be recruited at a later date. Details of the job description were provided to the visitors prior to the visit but at the time of the visit nobody had been recruited. The visitors therefore require information (such as a CV) about the new programme leader and their qualifications, experience and registration status.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence of a programme for staff development to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit it was clear the programme teaching staff adhered to the education provider wide staff development programme however, there was no specific evidence that the teaching staff for this programme were involved in any activities which would ensure their continuing professional and research development. Discussions at

the visit indicated activities were being undertaken and planned to be undertaken by teaching staff and the education provider played a part in encouraging this. Discussions at the visit indicated there would be an additional two new posts to be recruited for the profession specific team. The visitors require further information regarding the continuing professional and research development activities being undertaken and to be undertaken (such as a strategy or plan for existing and future staff development) and details of how the education provider plans to encourage this.

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 and resubmit the programme documentation to ensure the consent form and associated processes used to gain consent are included within the programme documentation.

Reason: The programme documentation provided prior to the visit did not include any consent form or information on consent procedures. The visitors were satisfied there was a consent procedure in place which was not communicated through the programme documentation. The visitors therefore require revised programme documentation which includes a method of obtaining consent (such as a consent form) which covers instances when students could participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching through the programme, along with information about any associated processes used for when students 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 revise and resubmit the programme documentation to identify the mandatory attendance requirements and the associated attendance policy for the programme.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit had only one section regarding attendance for the students. The section stated “students must attend all elements of university and practice modules” and identified that attendance would be monitored, recorded and the professional suitability process would deal with poor attendance (validation document p28). There was no further mention of attendance in the documentation. The visitors were unable to identify from this evidence the minimum requirements that were expected from students. Additionally the visitors were unable to identify any courses of action that would take place prior to the instigation of the professional suitability process (such as initial warnings, final warnings, interviews etc). The visitors therefore require revised programme documentation to identify the mandatory attendance requirements and the associated attendance policy for the programme.

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 revise and resubmit module descriptors which clearly articulate the taught content, learning outcomes and assessment of the learning outcomes to show how students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly identify where the learning outcomes that related to the standards of proficiency could be located within the programme. Discussions at the visit revealed there was taught and assessed content within the modules that was not indicated within the module descriptors. The visitors therefore require revised module descriptors to clearly articulate the taught content, learning outcomes and assessment of the learning outcomes to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency.

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 revise and resubmit the programme documentation to ensure there is explicit reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The documentation provided by the education provider made no explicit reference to the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics or the accompanying HPC Guidance on conduct and ethics for students 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 visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be revised to include specific references to the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the accompanying HPC Guidance on conduct and ethics for students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further documentation which demonstrates how it will ensure that the practice placement settings provide a safe environment.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit did not include any information about induction processes for students undertaken prior to a placement. Discussions at the visit indicated inductions were carried out which would ensure students were informed about risks, health and safety issues. The visitors were satisfied these were areas of concern for the education provider however require further evidence to demonstrate the inductions inform students

about risks and health and safety issues such as manual handling, physical risk from equipment, aggression (from service users, staff or students), emotional stress and working alone.

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 provide evidence that demonstrates how students and practice placement educators are informed about the timings and duration of placements, the expectations of professional conduct, the communication and lines of responsibility and the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress for all placements undertaken.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit did not make it clear how students and practice placement educators were informed about the timings and duration of placements, the expectations of professional conduct, the communication and lines of responsibility and the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress. Discussions at the visit with the students and programme team clarified the information was provided to placement educators and students. Discussions with the practice placement educators indicated the students were not fully aware of these areas for each placement attended. Discussions with the students and practice placement providers also indicated the parity of assessment across placements was ambiguous.

The visitors were satisfied that these were areas the education provider had considered however the students understanding that the placements are different and therefore require different understandings for each placement undertaken was not satisfactory. The visitors were satisfied the education provider made provision for the training regarding assessment however the difficulties and inconsistency in marking identified was not satisfactory. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence that these areas are more fully communicated to students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators so they are fully prepared for all 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 revisit the programme documentation to clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register or propose alternative arrangements with the HPC.

Reason: In the documentation provided there was insufficient detail regarding the appointment requirements for external examiners. The visitors were satisfied with the education provider wide assessment regulations however require evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiners on the programme have been included in the programme documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

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 ensuring more text books (especially core text books) are available through the electronic learning environment in place.

Reason: The visitors noted there was a system in place for acquiring text books online via an electronic learning environment. Discussions with the students indicated this was beneficial for students who were not able to easily access the library resources on site. The visitors noted that the amount of material available online did not cover a great deal of the recommended texts and especially the core text books and encourage the education provider to make more provision for these resources to be available online.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider strengthening their argument for practice placement providers to undertake the APPLE (Accredited Practice Placement Educators) training.

Reason: The visitors noted the education provider encourages all practice placement educators to undertake the APPLE training but few seem to take up the training. The College of Occupational Therapists accredits this training programme and it has benefits for the individual, the placement they work at and the education provider. APPLE gives professional recognition to the role of the Practice Placement Educator and establishes an accredited scheme that is transferable across regions. APPLE also supports HPC requirements for CPD activity through evidence of learning and application in the workplace. The visitors encourage the education provider to advertise the strengths and development opportunities this training programme has to the practice placement educators they work with in a more persuasive way.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue the collaborations between the education provider, practice placement provider and student in regards to the feedback processes in place.

Reason: From discussions at the visit with the practice placement provider it was evident that feedback processes had just been put in place which allowed the placement to gain feedback from the students. They stated they found this to be extremely beneficial and wished it to continue. The visitors encourage the education provider to continue with this process to ensure the placements continue to benefit from the feedback gained from students.

Sarah Johnson
Laura Graham

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	23-24 March 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8
Commendations	8

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. The education provider has until 17 May 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 8 June 2010 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 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 8 June 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 - programme admissions, programme management and resources. 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 - BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Full and Part time), MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) (Full time) and Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) (Full time). 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 bodies; outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Nicki Smith (Physiotherapy) Anthony Power (Physiotherapy)
HPC executive officer	Ben Potter
HPC observer	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Proposed student numbers	15
Initial approval	July 2006
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Nigel South (University of Essex)
Secretary	Kirstie Sceats (University of Essex)
Members of the joint panel	Nina Thompson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Sara Eastburn (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists and External Panel Member) Mike Wilson (Internal Panel Member)

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 ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 52 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 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

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 revise the programme documentation to identify the mandatory attendance requirements and the associated attendance policy for the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit had only one section regarding attendance for the students. The section stated “students must attend all elements of university and practice modules” and identified that attendance would be monitored, recorded and the professional suitability process would deal with poor attendance (validation document p28). There was no further mention of attendance in the documentation. In discussion with the students and the programme team the visitors noted that there was an informal mandatory attendance level of 80%. However the visitors were unable to identify any courses of action that would take place prior to the instigation of the professional suitability process if this level was not. The visitors therefore require revised programme documentation to identify any mandatory attendance requirements and the associated attendance policy for the programme.

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 revise programme documentation to make explicit where and when within the programme students can expect to receive cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) training.

Reason: The visitors noted in discussions with students, practice placement educators and the programme team that while CPR training was now provided at the education provider the prior provision of this training had been irregular. The visitors felt that due to this there is the potential for gaps in the knowledge of the students graduating from the programme which could prevent students meeting the Standards of Proficiency (SoP) for physiotherapists in particular SoP 3a.1 (p.12 of the Standards of Proficiency for physiotherapists). The visitors therefore require revised programme documentation to identify when and where students can expect CPR training as part of the programme to avoid potential gaps in knowledge arising in the future.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of planning to continue to provide and encourage practice placement educators to undertake adequate training.

Reason: The visitors noted in discussions with the students, practice placement providers, senior team that there were some practice placement educators who had not undertaken appropriate practice placement educator training. They also

acknowledged the difficulties in getting practice placement educators to attend training. In discussions with the programme team the efforts undertaken to train practice placement educators and the belief that at least 80% of practice placement educators had been appropriately trained were also noted. However the visitors felt that the efforts to train practice placement educators should be maintained to ensure that students continue to achieve their learning outcomes from practice placements. The visitors therefore require documentation to detail how the education provider will continue to meet this SET in particular plans around future provision of training and any possible developments for the future such as online training.

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 revise programme documentation to make explicit what assessment students will expect to be subject to when completing CPR training.

Reason: The visitors noted in discussions with students, practice placement educators and the programme team that while CPR training was now provided at the education provider the prior provision of this training had been irregular which has affected SET 4.1 and SoP 3a.1 as outlined above. While there is now a regular provision of CPR training at the education provider the visitors were unable to identify any assessment methodology to ensure students had passed the training satisfactorily. The visitors therefore require the assessment procedure for CPR training to be clearly articulated within the programme documentation to identify how students can expect CPR training to be assessed to avoid potential gaps in knowledge arising in the future which could affect their ability to meet the relevant SoP.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that in the documentation provided there was insufficient detail regarding the appointment requirements for external examiners. The visitors were satisfied with the education provider wide assessment regulations. However they require evidence that the HPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners for the programme have been included in the programme documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider embedding reflective practice across all years of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation, specifically in the validation document (p12 and 21), the module checklist (module HS367) and in discussions with the programme team that reflective practice is supported and developed within the programme. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this SET continues to be met. However they suggest that to reinforce the practice of reflective thinking it could be introduced in earlier modules and embedded throughout the rest of the programme.

Nicky Smith
Anthony Power

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	23 – 24 March 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	13

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 17 May 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 8 June 2010 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 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 8 June 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 and validating body validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Part time and Full time accelerated) and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Full time). 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 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	Sarah Johnson (Occupational Therapist) Laura Graham (Occupational Therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	27
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2010
Chair	Nigel South (University of Essex)
Secretary	Kirstie Sceats (University of Essex)
Members of the joint panel	Remy Reyes (College of Occupational Therapists) Claire Brewis (College of Occupational Therapists) Auldeen Alsop (College of Occupational Therapists) Timothy Dennis (Internal Panel Member)

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

The HPC did not review External examiners' reports from the last two years 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) Occupational Therapy, 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 42 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 15 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

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate the systems that are in place to manage the programme effectively.

Reason: From the programme documentation provided prior to the visit the information regarding evidence of regular monitoring and evaluation systems was not clear. Discussions at the visit revealed the programme was subject to regular monitoring and evaluation systems. The visitors were satisfied the programme had regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place which were not fully explained in the documentation provided. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the monitoring and evaluation systems in place (clarifications of the groups and committees involved at the programme level with details of what they do) to demonstrate the systems are in place and manage the programme effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide information regarding the two new staff members expertise and knowledge once they have been recruited.

Reason: From discussions at the visit it was revealed that there would be two new staff members recruited shortly into the programme team. The programme team at the time of the visit was relatively small and the addition of the new staff members would prove challenging when ensuring there is enough relevant specialist expertise and knowledge within the programme team. The visitors require the information about the new staff members including their expertise and knowledge (such as CVs) to ensure there is an appropriate balance of breadth of expertise and knowledge through the programme team.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence of a programme for staff development to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit it was clear the programme teaching staff adhered to the education provider wide staff development programme however, there was no specific evidence that the teaching staff for this programme were involved in any activities which would ensure their continuing professional and research development. Discussions at the visit indicated activities were being undertaken and planned to be undertaken by teaching staff and the education provider played a part in encouraging this. Discussions at the visit indicated there would be an additional two new posts to be recruited for the profession specific team. The visitors require further

information regarding the continuing professional and research development activities being undertaken and to be undertaken (such as a strategy or plan for existing and future staff development) and details of how the education provider plans to encourage this.

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 and resubmit the programme documentation to ensure the consent form and associated processes used to gain consent are included within the programme documentation.

Reason: The programme documentation provided prior to the visit did not include any consent form or information on consent procedures. The visitors were satisfied there was a consent procedure in place which was not communicated through the programme documentation. The visitors therefore require revised programme documentation which includes a method of obtaining consent (such as a consent form) which covers instances when students could participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching through the programme, along with information about any associated processes used for when students 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 revise and resubmit the programme documentation to identify the mandatory attendance requirements and the associated attendance policy for the programme.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit had only one section regarding attendance for the students. The section stated “students must attend all elements of university and practice modules” and identified that attendance would be monitored, recorded and the professional suitability process would deal with poor attendance (validation document p28). There was no further mention of attendance in the documentation. The visitors were unable to identify from this evidence the minimum requirements that were expected from students. Additionally the visitors were unable to identify any courses of action that would take place prior to the instigation of the professional suitability process (such as initial warnings, final warnings, interviews etc). The visitors therefore require revised programme documentation to identify the mandatory attendance requirements and the associated attendance policy for the programme.

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 revise and resubmit module descriptors which clearly articulate the taught content, learning outcomes and assessment of

the learning outcomes to show how students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly identify where the learning outcomes that related to the standards of proficiency could be located within the programme. Discussions at the visit revealed there was taught and assessed content within the modules that was not indicated within the module descriptors. The visitors therefore require revised module descriptors to clearly articulate the taught content, learning outcomes and assessment of the learning outcomes to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise and resubmit documentation to clearly articulate how the modules that integrate theory and practice are managed to ensure theory and practice are taught effectively and how this is communicated.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit had specific reference to modules which taught both theory and practice. The documentation did not make it clear how the two aspects of the modules were taught together. For circumstances where one part of this combined module was failed there was no information regarding strategies to ensure the student did not lose any opportunities to make up the failed aspects whilst continuing with the programme. The tightly packed placement arrangements within the programme seemed to make it difficult for the student to repeat one placement whilst doing another. The visitors therefore require further information that clearly articulates how the combined modules manage to ensure theory and practice are taught effectively and how this information is communicated to students, practice placement providers and the programme team.

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 revise and resubmit the programme documentation to ensure there is explicit reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The documentation provided by the education provider made no explicit reference to the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics or the accompanying HPC Guidance on conduct and ethics for students 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 visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be revised to include specific references to the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the accompanying HPC Guidance on conduct and ethics for students.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate how the programme supports and develops autonomous and reflective thinking.

Reason: The documentation provided did not make it clear how this programme supports and develops autonomous and reflective thinking at a level appropriate to an MSc or Post Graduate Diploma. The documentation provided was in part combined documentation with the BSc level programme taught. The visitors were unable to clearly identify any educational rationale, learning/teaching strategy or educational philosophy appropriate to the level of MSc or Post Graduate Diploma. The visitors therefore require further documentation that clearly articulates how the programme supports and develops autonomous and reflective thinking at the level appropriate to this programme.

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate the practice placements are fully prepared to undertake students from this programme.

Reason: The discussions at the visit and documentation provided did not demonstrate the practice placements would be fully prepared to undertake students from this programme. The documentation provided relating to practice placements was combined with the documentation from the BSc programme taught. The documentation also contained specific reference to combined theory and practice modules taught within this programme which heavily relied on the practice placements. The visitors were not clear how the programme ensured that the practice placement providers were prepared for the difference of levels that the students would be at (either BSc or MSc/Post Graduate Diploma level). The visitors were not clear as to how the practice placement educators were made aware of how the combined theory and practice modules were taught and dealt with differently from the BSc Placements and also in the case of any student failing a placement. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the practice placements that are integral to the programme are fully prepared to undertake students from the MSc/Post Graduate Diploma programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further documentation which demonstrates how it will ensure that the practice placement settings provide a safe environment.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit did not include any information about induction processes for students undertaken prior to a

placement. Discussions at the visit indicated inductions were carried out which would ensure students were informed about risks, health and safety issues. The visitors were satisfied these were areas of concern for the education provider however require further evidence to demonstrate the inductions inform students about risks and health and safety issues such as manual handling, physical risk from equipment, aggression (from service users, staff or students), emotional stress and working alone.

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 provide evidence that demonstrates how students and practice placement educators are informed about the learning outcomes to be achieved, the timings and duration of placements, the expectations of professional conduct, the communication and lines of responsibility and the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress for all placements undertaken.

Reason: The documentation provided relating to practice placements was combined with the documentation from the taught BSc programme. The documentation was unclear as to how students and practice placement educators were informed about the learning outcomes to be achieved, the timings and duration of placements, the expectations of professional conduct, the communication and lines of responsibility and the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress of the MSc/Post Graduate Diploma level programme. Discussions at the visit with the (BSc programme) students and programme team clarified the information was provided to placement educators and students. Discussions with the practice placement educators indicated the (BSc programme) students were not fully aware of these areas for each placement attended. Discussions with the (BSc programme) students and practice placement providers also indicated the parity of assessment across placements was ambiguous.

The visitors were not clear how the programme ensured that the practice placement providers were prepared for the difference of levels that the students would be at (either BSc or MSc/Post Graduate Diploma level) in the teaching and assessment of the learning outcomes. The visitors were satisfied that these were areas the education provider had considered for the BSc programme but uncertain as to how they considered them for the MSc/Post Graduate Diploma. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence that the difference between the levels for the BSc and MSc/Post Graduate Diploma

programmes is communicated to practice placement providers and that these areas are more fully communicated to students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators so they are fully prepared for all placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise and resubmit module descriptors which clearly articulate the taught content, learning outcomes and the assessment methods employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were unable to clearly identify where the learning outcomes that related to the standards of proficiency could be located within the programme. Discussions at the visit revealed there was taught and assessed content within the modules that was not indicated within the module descriptors. The visitors therefore require revised module descriptors to clearly articulate the taught content, learning outcomes and the assessment methods employed that measure the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise and resubmit documentation to clearly articulate how the modules that integrate theory and practice are managed in relation to student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit had specific reference to modules which taught both theory and practice. The visitors were satisfied with the education provider wide assessment regulations; however the programme documentation failed to give information on progression and achievement in relation to the combined theory and practice modules. The tightly packed placement arrangements within the programme seemed to make it difficult for the student to repeat one placement whilst doing another. For circumstances where one part of this combined module was failed there was no information regarding strategies to ensure the student did not lose any opportunities to progress through the programme. The visitors therefore require further information that clearly articulates how student progression and achievement within the combined theory and practice modules is managed and how this information is communicated to students, practice placement providers and the programme team.

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

Reason: In the documentation provided there was insufficient detail regarding the appointment requirements for external examiners. The visitors were satisfied with the education provider wide assessment regulations however require evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiners on the programme have been included in the programme documentation to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue its efforts in getting its mentorship module developed and accredited.

Reason: Discussions at the visit revealed the education provider was embarking on the process of getting a mentorship module accredited. The mentorship module would be open to practice placement educators to undertake. The visitors support and encourage this endeavour as it would be extremely beneficial in preparing to support students from this programme and for the practice placements own development.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to ensure the programme teams continuing professional and research development.

Reason: Discussions at the visit indicated the programme team were involved in various activities to continue their professional and research development. To ensure the staff keep themselves relevant to current affairs, involved in practice, research, professional bodies and the development of other programmes the visitors encourage the education provider to maintain the opportunities available. This will ensure the programme teams continuing professional and research development alongside the academic teaching activities they are all involved in.

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 ensuring more text books (especially core text books) are available through the electronic learning environment in place.

Reason: The visitors noted there was a system in place for acquiring text books online via an electronic learning environment. Discussions with the (BSc programme) students indicated this was beneficial for students who were not able to easily access the library resources on site. The visitors noted that the amount of material available online did not cover a great deal of the recommended texts and especially the core text books and encourage the education provider to make more provision for these resources to be available online.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to ensure the academic and pastoral student support is suitable and widely available for all students.

Reason: The visitors noted that students to the MSc/Post Graduate Diploma programme would be of a different nature to those of the already running BSc programme. The visitors encourage the education provider to acknowledge and address the potential diversity of the students undertaking this programme and ensure the academic and pastoral student support is suitable and widely available for all students.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider strengthening their argument for practice placement providers to undertake the APPLE (Accredited Practice Placement Educators) training.

Reason: The visitors noted the education provider encourages all practice placement educators to undertake the APPLE training but few seem to take up the training. The College of Occupational Therapists accredits this training programme and it has benefits for the individual, the placement they work at and the education provider. APPLE gives professional recognition to the role of the Practice Placement Educator and establishes an accredited scheme that is transferable across regions. APPLE also supports HPC requirements for CPD activity through evidence of learning and application in the workplace. The visitors encourage the education provider to advertise the strengths and development opportunities this training programme has to the practice placement educators they work with in a more persuasive way.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue the collaborations between the education provider, practice placement provider and student in regards to the feedback processes in place.

Reason: From discussions at the visit with the practice placement provider it was evident that feedback processes had just been put in place which allowed the placement to gain feedback from the students. They stated they found this to be extremely beneficial and wished it to continue. The visitors encourage the education provider to continue with this process to ensure the placements continue to benefit from the feedback gained from students.

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

Recommendation: The education provider could consider changing their assessment strategy methods in placements from the graded assessments to a competency based pass/fail assessment.

Reason: Discussions at the visit with (BSc programme) students stated the graded placements created problems with the parity of assessments and the subjectivity of assessments. The visitors agreed this standard was met but felt the programme would be further enhanced by moving to a competency based pass/fail approach. This would lead to more equity between placements and take away the element of subjectivity the students noted. The visitors noted that feedback given via the graded assessments could be given throughout the placements instead of relying on the final assessment. The visitors noted that this may make the moderation of assessments at placements easier and recommend the move to this method of assessment.

Sarah Johnson
Laura Graham

University of Essex

**Observations on the Reports for BSc (Hons)Physiotherapy; BSC, MSC & PGDip Occupational
Therapy Approval visit 23-24 March 2010 at the University of Essex**

The Course teams wish to make the following observation as regards the following condition against SET 4.5 which was applied to both the BSc and MSc Occupational Therapy:

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 revise and resubmit the programme documentation to ensure there is explicit reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The documentation provided by the education provider made no explicit reference to the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics or the accompanying HPC Guidance on conduct and ethics for students 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 visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be revised to include specific references to the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the accompanying HPC Guidance on conduct and ethics for students.

BSc Occupational Therapy

We draw your attention to Page 77 of the existing module document: Competence in Occupational Therapy Practice HS355-6-PS Learning outcome 7 "Have an in depth knowledge and understanding of the Health Professions Council"

This is supported in the reading list with both the Standards of Proficiency reference and Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics

MSc Occupational Therapy

We draw your attention to Page 103 of module document. Competence in Occupational Therapy Practice HS875-7-SU Learning outcome 7 "Have an in depth knowledge and understanding of the Health Professions Council"

This is supported in the reading list with both the Standards of Proficiency reference and Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics

In addition the students are referred to the Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics in the practice handbook (reference list page 107)

Although no mention of the HPC Guidance on conduct and ethics for students is made, this was only circulated to HEIs mid January after documentation was prepared.

The reason provided for the condition against SET 4.5 seems to suggest there is no mention of the standards in any reading lists or learning outcomes which seems inaccurate.

The Course Teams have no observations to make on the report for the BSc Physiotherapy.

Kirstie Sceats

Assistant Academic Officer (Health Courses)

14 May 2010