

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	6 – 8 May 2009

Contents

Contents.....	1
Executive summary.....	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions	7
Recommendations	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 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' 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 2009. At the Committee meeting on 25 August 2009, 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 continues to meet 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 retains open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

The education provider changed their name at the same time as the approvals visit was carried out. This report reflects the education provider's new name.

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 - 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 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) Physiotherapy, Pg Dip Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Pg Dip Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration) and Pg Dip Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration). 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	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Rachel Greig
Proposed student numbers	15
Initial approval	1 September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 January 2010
Chair	Angela Morgan (Teesside University) Judith Poch (Chair of sub-group, Teesside University)
Secretary	John Holmes (Teesside University) Janice Turner (Secretary of sub-group, Teesside University)
Members of the joint panel	Sue Johnson (Internal panel member) Nicola Phillips (External panel member) Steve Pett (External panel member)

	Diana Davis (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy) Nina Thomson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy)
--	---

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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

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

6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The education provider must clearly state in their assessment regulations that the appointed external examiner for the programme must be from the relevant part of the HPC register unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: Upon consulting the external examiner framework document the visitors were satisfied that the appropriate measures were in place when appointing an external examiner however felt this process should be clearly defined within the programme assessment regulations.

Recommendations

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider should carefully monitor the service user and carer engagement strategy.

Reason: The implementation of the service user and carer engagement strategy is still in its early stages within this programme so its effectiveness within the programme is yet to be determined. By closely monitoring this system the programme team can ensure that the stated objectives of the strategy are being met and that they will be alerted to any problems that may require attention.

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider monitors the outcome of the new inter-professional learning strategy to ensure that profession specific skills and knowledge continue to be adequately addressed.

Reason: The programme team have made a number of changes to the teaching of inter-professional learning throughout the programme and the implementation of these changes is still in their early stages. By closely monitoring this new strategy of teaching the programme team can determine the level of effectiveness these changes have had on its programme and can ensure that profession specific skills are addressed.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should continue to explore widening the range of placements to respond effectively to changing patterns of employment.

Reason: Discussions with the programme team stated that although there was no formal policy in place to seek out different placements for students the team were in negotiations to widen their range of practice placements. The visitors noted the importance of this as they felt the range of physiotherapy placements offered, although sufficient to meet the SET, were quite narrow. In order to respond to changes in the market place the visitors felt it would be beneficial for the education provider to widen their range of placements to include opportunities in non-traditional areas.

Anthony Power
Valerie Maehle