

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	18-20 January 2017

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	10

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 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 HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 13 March 2017 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 23 March 2017. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 27 March 2017. 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 25 May 2017.

Introduction

The HCPC 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 HCPC 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 the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, BSc (Hons) Occupational therapy and MPhysio Sports and Exercise Medicine. The education provider, the professional bodies and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) Rebecca Khanna (Occupational therapist) Christine Morgan (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah (Occupational therapy and Physiotherapy panel lead) Rebecca Stent (Diagnostic radiography panel lead)
Proposed student numbers	60 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
First approved intake	September 1997
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	Josie Fraser (University of Bradford)
Secretary	Kirstin Bell (University of Bradford)
Members of the joint panel	Chakib Kara-Zaitri (Internal Panel Member) Ed Mallen (Internal Panel Member) Farah Shah (Student Panel Member) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational therapists) Jackie Taylor (College of Occupational therapists) Nina Paterson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)

	Jacqueline Mullan (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Isabella Sarapong (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Rebecca Sandys (Society of Radiographers) Ruth Strudwick (Society of Radiographers)
--	--

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC 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 HCPC 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"/>
Service users and carers	<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 satisfied 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 the relevant 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 6 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made one recommendation for the programme.

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

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 clarify who will pay for the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks, and how this will be communicated to applicants.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that no additional costs for students had been mentioned in the information for applicants such as the cost of DBS checks, despite the funding reforms which come into effect in September 2017. During the meeting with the students, the visitors were told that the education provider paid for the DBS checks. The programme team also agreed that they paid for the DBS checks, but they did mention that this may change for the 2017-2018 academic year. As such, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they let applicants know about the additional costs associated with the DBS checks.

2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate what the health requirements are, how they are appropriate to the content of the programme, and how students are told about these requirements

Reason: From a review of the admissions documentation available to applicants, the visitors noted that the education provider outlines that, as part of fulfilling the entry requirements to be admitted onto the programme, applicants must complete “an occupational health questionnaire and possible attendance at a medical appointment”. This was confirmed by the students at the visit. Additionally, during the student meeting at the visit, the students mentioned that they had to be vaccinated before they started on the programme. However, the visitors were unclear on what the health requirements were and where this information was made available to applicants. As the visitors did not know what the health requirements were they could not determine whether these requirements were appropriate for the content of the programme and could also not determine how the relevant health checks are carried out and processed as part of the admissions process. The education provider therefore needs to provide evidence which clearly outlines the health requirements for the programme to applicants, the appropriateness to the content of the programme and how students are told about these health requirements.

3.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that with the proposed increase in student numbers there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the staff curriculum vitae. During the visit, the senior and programme team told the visitors that they will be increasing the student numbers and would want the programme approved for 60 students. The visitors

were told that the BSc Physiotherapy academics will also teach on the new MPhysio programme (which has been asked to be approved for 50 students). At the visit, the visitors were also told about the work load model which helps manage the staff members' workloads and identify areas where they may need support. The visitors noted that the number of staff highlighted in the programme documentation was adequate for the current student numbers (55 students) the programme is approved for. However, the education provider did not demonstrate how they will ensure there will be an adequate number of staff to deliver the programme effectively, with the increase in student numbers and the additional commitments of the staff team to other programmes. Furthermore the visitors are unclear on how the work load model will ensure that there is an adequate number of staff to deliver the programme effectively. The visitors will therefore need to see evidence which demonstrates how the increase in student numbers and additional commitments of the staff team will be managed to ensure that there is an appropriate number of qualified and experienced staff for the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how students and staff are clear about the assessment regulations, including any waivers, in relation to student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the programme specification, standard assessment regulations for the University of Bradford and a document with the exceptions (waivers) to these regulations. The visitors noted that the programme uses university-wide assessment regulations but that there are four exceptions (waivers) to these regulations around student progression and achievement which apply to certain modules. However, the visitors were unclear as to how these waivers work in practice in relation to student progression and achievement throughout the programme. For example, one of the waivers specifies that 'all students undertaking modules of 40 and 60 credits will undertake units of assessment over the academic year. Each unit of assessment will be assigned an equivalent credit value.' However, the visitors did not see a breakdown of assessment or component credits within the modules, therefore they were unclear about which part of the modules these waivers would apply to. As such, the visitors could not see how students would be clear about how they progress and achieve within the programme, and how staff would be able to make consistent decisions in relation to student progression. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how students and staff are clear about the assessment regulations, including any waivers, in relation to student progression and achievement within the programme.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the programme documentation clearly articulates that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the University assessment regulations regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could not see in the assessment regulations or programme documentation where it clearly states that

aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors were also unclear on how the education provider ensures that students are aware of this. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the assessment regulations clearly specify that aegrotat award do not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

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 provide further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is from a relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to page 3 of the guide to external examining for taught programmes: chapter 3: criteria for appointment which states that external examiners must meet “applicable criteria set out by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies.” However, the visitors could not be certain from this evidence that this would mean that the HCPC standard would be met as it is not defined in the assessment regulations as to whether the external examiners would have to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register and, if not, that there is an appropriate reason for appointing an examiner who is not from the relevant part of the Register. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations for this programme specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is from a relevant part of the HCPC Register, and, if not, that there is an appropriate reason for appointing an examiner who is not from the relevant part of the Register.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that that the education provider informs the HCPC if the regulations differ from the proposed regulations approved by HCPC once they have gone through the education provider's internal validation process.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the programme specification, standard assessment regulations for the University of Bradford and a document with the exceptions (waivers) to these regulations. The visitors noted that the programme uses university-wide assessment regulations but that there are four exceptions (waivers) to these regulations around student progression and achievement which apply to certain modules. As the visitors are currently unclear about how these regulations will apply to this programme, the visitors are aware that the wording could change further once the waivers go through the education provider's validation process even after they may have been approved by the HCPC. As such, the visitors recommend that that they inform the HCPC if the regulations differ from the proposed regulations approved by HCPC.

Fleur Kitsell
Rebecca Khanna
Christine Morgan

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality / domain	Diagnostic radiographer
Date of visit	18 – 20 January 2017

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	11

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'radiographer' or 'diagnostic radiographer' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 13 March 2017 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 23 March 2017. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 27 March 2017. 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 25 May 2017.

Introduction

The HCPC 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 HCPC 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 the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy. The education provider, the professional bodies and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) Helen Best (Diagnostic radiographer) Roseann Connolly (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Rebecca Stent (Diagnostic radiography panel lead) Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah (Occupational therapy and physiotherapy panel lead)
Proposed student numbers	50 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
First approved intake	September 1993
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	Josie Fraser for the joint panel meetings (University of Bradford) Chakib Kara-Zairtri (University of Bradford) for the Diagnostic Radiography meetings
Secretary	Kirsten Bell (University of Bradford)
Members of the joint panel	Ed Mallen (Internal Panel Member) Farah Shah (Student Panel Member) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational therapists) Jackie Taylor (College of Occupational therapists)

	<p>Nina Paterson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)</p> <p>Jacqueline Mullan (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)</p> <p>Isabella Sarapong (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)</p> <p>Rebecca Sandys (Society of Radiographers)</p> <p>Ruth Strudwick (Society of Radiographers)</p>
--	--

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC 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 HCPC 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"/>
Service users and carers	<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 satisfied 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 the relevant 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 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. 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 can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

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 provide further evidence to demonstrate how the information made available to potential applicants is clear and consistent that successful completion of the programme will allow eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register as a diagnostic radiographer.

Reason: In documents provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted on page 9 of the programme specification – a document which is available to applicants - that students are eligible to apply for Registration with the HCPC. The visitors were satisfied with this statement as this is correct and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC. However, the visitors also noted the following statement on the education provider's website advertising the programme to applicants: "by the end of your studies you will meet the professional educational standards expected by the HCPC." The visitors noted that this statement could be misleading to applicants as students are only eligible to apply to the HCPC Register and will not automatically fulfil HCPC requirements. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the admissions information available to applicants is clear and consistent in delivering the message that successful completion of the programme will allow eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register as a diagnostic radiographer so that they can make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate what the health requirements are, how they are appropriate to the content of the programme, and how students are told about these requirements.

Reason: From a review of the admissions documentation available to applicants, the visitors noted that the education provider clearly outlines that, as part of fulfilling the entry requirements to be admitted onto the course, applicants must complete "an assessment by an occupational health department" to ensure that "the student can meet the physical and emotional demands of the programme and the requirements of the Faculty's Learning and Development agreement with the Yorkshire and Humber Strategic Health Authority for protection of the public" (page 16 of the Programme specification and the university web page). However, the visitors were unclear from this documentation for applicants as to what the health requirements of the Faculty's Learning and Development agreement are and how this information is made available to applicants. As the visitors did not know what all of the health requirements were they could not determine whether these requirements were appropriate to the content of the programme and could also not determine how applicants would be aware of all of them. The education provider therefore needs to provide evidence which clearly outlines the health requirements for the programme, the appropriateness to the content of the programme and how students are told about these health requirements.

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 provide further evidence to clarify how the 100 per cent attendance requirement is applied appropriately to placements of varying length, as well as how this is monitored and communicated to students.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors learnt that students would be out in placement for 18 weeks a year completing between 24 and 34 hours a week at placement (depending on their rota) with a minimum of 24 hours per week. The visitors also learnt from this documentation that 100 per cent attendance is required at placement, and that the personal attendance requirement is stated in individual placement rotas (RAD10 Clinical Portfolio document, page 17). At the visit, the visitors heard from the students on the current programme that they complete an average of 34.5 hours a week but this depends on their weekly rota which is different across different placements sites. The programme team stated that students would be in placement between 24 and 30 hours a week on the revised programme from September 2017, and confirmed that no student would complete less than 24 hours a week or more than 30 hours a week. The programme team also stated that students are required to make up any missed placement experience according to their individual rota. The visitors were satisfied that, if students completed a minimum of 24 hours a week, the duration of placements would be appropriate to support the delivery of the learning outcomes. However, the visitors were not clear about the total compulsory number of hours of placement experience each individual student is required to attend as it was unclear what 100 per cent attendance at placement equates to due to the differences in individual rotas at placement. The visitors were also unclear about how the education provider has a robust monitoring mechanism for ensuring that students have attended 100 per cent of the required placement experience where students are completing a different number of hours per week, and also how students are clear about these attendance requirements. As such, the visitors require further evidence to clarify the 100 per cent attendance requirement at placement where individual placement rotas are different as well as how this is monitored by the education provider and clearly communicated to students.

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 further evidence to demonstrate how students are fully prepared for placement in relation to the duration of any placement experience.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors learnt that students would be out in placement for 18 weeks a year completing between 24 and 34 hours a week at placement (depending on their individual rota) with a minimum of 24 hours per week (RAD10 Clinical Portfolio document, page 17). At the visit, the programme team stated that students would be in placement between 24 and 30 hours a week on the revised programme from September 2017 and confirmed that no student would complete less than 24 hours a week or more than 30 hours a week. The visitors noted that this was inconsistent with the information provided to students and, as such, they were not satisfied that students would be fully prepared for placement in relation to the duration of any placement experience. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that this information will be clearly and consistently communicated to students so that they are fully prepared for placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that demonstrates how the measurement of student performance for the Objective Patient Assessments is objective and consistent.

Reason: In documents provided prior to the visit, the visitors learnt that students have to undertake Objective Patient Assessments at placement. These are assessed by one clinical supervisor and have to be passed in order to progress through the programme and achieve an award. The visitors also learnt on page 23 of the clinical portfolio document that if students fail the first attempt, they may be permitted one more attempt by the Board of Examiners. However, in discussions at the visit, the visitors learnt that some clinical supervisors will stop the Objective Patient Assessment and call it a practice if they feel a student is not performing as they know they can, whereas some clinical supervisors would fail the student and count it as their first formal attempt. Therefore, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that all clinical supervisors are conducting these assessments in a consistent and objective way. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that the measurement of student performance in the Objective Patient Assessment is objective, particularly in relation to how clinical supervisors decide whether it is a formal assessment or whether the assessment can be stopped and considered a practice.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how students and staff are clear about the assessment regulations, including any waivers, in relation to student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the programme specification, standard assessment regulations for the University of Bradford and a document with the exceptions (waivers) to these regulations. The visitors noted that the programme uses university-wide assessment regulations but that there are two exceptions (waivers) to these regulations around student progression and achievement which apply to certain modules. However, the visitors were unclear as to how these waivers work in practice in relation to student progression and achievement throughout the programme. For example, one of the waivers specifies credits where these waivers would be applied but, as the visitors did not see a breakdown of credit components of modules, they were unclear about which part of the modules these waivers would apply to. As such, the visitors could not see how students would be clear about how they progress and achieve within the programme, and how staff would be able to make consistent decisions in relation to student progression. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how students and staff are clear about the assessment regulations, including any waivers, in relation to student progression and achievement within the programme.

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 provide further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is from a relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to page 3 of the guide to external examining for taught programmes: chapter 3: criteria for appointment which states that external examiners must meet “applicable criteria set out by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies.” However, the visitors could not be certain from this evidence that this would mean that the HCPC standard would be met as it is not defined in the assessment regulations as to whether the external examiners would have to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register and, if not, that there is an appropriate reason for appointing an examiner who is not from the relevant part of the Register. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations for this programme specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is from a relevant part of the HCPC Register, and, if not, that there is an appropriate reason for appointing an examiner who is not from the relevant part of the Register.

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider updates the website as soon as possible so that applicants are receiving accurate and consistent information across all platforms where admissions information is provided for applicants, including the UCAS tariff points.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors reviewed the information for applicants in the programme specification which is available to applicants through the programme web page, as well as the programme web page. The visitors were satisfied with the information for applicants in the programme specification and the correct tariff points on the university web page. However, the visitors noted that the information in the programme specification was not completely consistent with the information on the web page itself, including the UCAS tariff points required to access the programme. The programme team stated that they would inform applicants at the interview stage of all the required and correct information about the programme in order for applicants to make an informed decision but that the website cannot be updated to reflect changes made to the programme until the changes have been formally approved. The visitors accepted this as a reasonable response but they recommend that the website is updated as soon as possible once the changes have been approved.

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.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider keeps the information for applicants under review in light of the funding reforms and any future additional costs which may occur for students in the future.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that no additional costs for students had been mentioned in the information for applicants such as the cost of DBS checks, despite the funding reforms which come into effect in September 2017. At the visit, the programme team clarified that for the academic year 2017-18, there will be no additional costs for students and that the university would continue to pay for costs related to placement and the DBS checks. However, the programme team acknowledged that there may be additional costs for students in the future, such as uniform costs or DBS check costs. As such, the visitors recommend that the education provider keeps information to applicants under review in relation to any future costs which the student may be required to cover on this programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that that the education provider informs the HCPC if the regulations differ from the proposed regulations approved by HCPC once they have gone through the education provider's internal validation process.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the programme specification, standard assessment regulations for the University of Bradford and a document with the exceptions (waivers) to these regulations. The visitors noted that the programme uses university-wide assessment regulations but that there are two exceptions (waivers) to these regulations around student progression and achievement which apply to certain modules. As the visitors are currently unclear about how these regulations will apply to this programme, the visitors are aware that the wording could change further once the waivers go through the education provider's validation process even after they may have been approved by the HCPC. As such, the visitors recommend that they inform the HCPC if the regulations differ from the proposed regulations approved by HCPC.

Martin Benwell
Helen Best
Roseann Connolly

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	18-20 January 2017

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	12

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 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 HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 13 March 2017 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 23 March 2017. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 27 March 2017. 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 25 May 2017.

Introduction

The HCPC 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 HCPC 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 the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and MPhysio Sports and Exercise Medicine. The education provider, the professional bodies and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) Rebecca Khanna (Occupational therapist) Christine Morgan (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah (Occupational therapy and Physiotherapy panel lead) Rebecca Stent (Diagnostic radiography panel lead)
Proposed student numbers	40 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
First approved intake	September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	Josie Fraser (University of Bradford)
Secretary	Kirstin Bell (University of Bradford)
Members of the joint panel	Chakib Kara-Zaitri (Internal Panel Member) Ed Mallen (Internal Panel Member) Farah Shah (Student Panel Member) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational therapists) Jackie Taylor (College of Occupational therapists) Nina Paterson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)

	Jacqueline Mullan (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Isabella Sarapong (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Rebecca Sandys (Society of Radiographers) Ruth Strudwick (Society of Radiographers)
--	--

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC 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 HCPC 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"/>
Service users and carers	<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 satisfied 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 the relevant 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 48 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 have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence

The visitors have also made one recommendation for the programme.

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

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 provide further evidence to ensure that the information available to potential applicants is consistent in delivering the message that successful completion of the programme will allow eligibility to apply to the Register as an occupational therapist.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to programme specification and the programme web page. The visitors noted that there were inconsistencies in the admissions information available to students. In the programme specification it states that “The award of BSc (Honours) Occupational Therapy confers eligibility to apply for registration with the health and care professions council (HCPC).” However on the programme web page available to students it states that “by the end of your studies, you will meet the professional educational standards expected by the College of Occupational Therapists, the HCPC and the World Federation of Occupational Therapists”. The visitors noted that this statement could be misleading to applicants as students are only eligible to apply to the HCPC Register and will not automatically fulfil HCPC requirements. The education provider will therefore need to ensure that all the admissions information available to potential applicants is consistent and clear in delivering the message that successful completion of the programme will allow eligibility to apply to the Register as an occupational therapist.

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 clarify who will pay for the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks, and how this will be communicated to applicants.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that no additional costs for students had been mentioned in the information for applicants such as the cost of DBS checks, despite the funding reforms which come into effect in September 2017. During the meeting with the students, the visitors were told that the education provider paid for the DBS checks. The programme team also agreed that they paid for the DBS checks, but they did mention that this may change for the 2017-2018 academic year. As such, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they let applicants know about the additional costs associated with the DBS checks.

2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate what the health requirements are, how they are appropriate to the content of the programme, and how students are told about these requirements

Reason: From a review of the admissions documentation available to applicants, the visitors noted that the education provider outlines that, as part of fulfilling the entry

requirements to be admitted onto the programme, applicants must complete “an occupational health questionnaire and possible attendance at a medical appointment”. This was confirmed by the students at the visit. Additionally, during the student meeting at the visit, the students mentioned that they had to be vaccinated before they started on the programme. However, the visitors were unclear on what the health requirements were and where this information was made available to applicants. As the visitors did not know what the health requirements were they could not determine whether these requirements were appropriate to the content of the programme and could also not determine how the relevant health checks are carried out and processed as part of the admissions process. The education provider therefore needs to provide evidence which clearly outlines the health requirements for the programme to applicants, the appropriateness to the content of the programme and how students are told about these health requirements.

3.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that, with the proposed increase in student numbers, there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the staff curriculum vitae. The visitors noted that this number of staff was adequate for the current student numbers (20 students) for which the programme is approved. During the visit, the senior team and programme team told the visitors that they will be increasing the student numbers and would want the programme approved for 40 students. The visitors were told that, in order to deal with the increase in students, there will be various work arounds, including double teaching, recruitment of administrative staff to take on the administrative responsibilities of academic staff and a work load model which would help identify areas where staff may need support. However, the education provider did not demonstrate how they will ensure that there are formal plans and arrangements in place to demonstrate how the university will ensure there will continue to be an adequate number of staff to deliver the programme effectively, with the increase in student numbers. The visitors will therefore need to see further evidence of formal plans in place ensure that there are an adequate number of staff to deliver an effective programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the module descriptors to ensure that the resources to support student learning are kept up to date and effectively used.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the module descriptors that the education provider has referenced the 2008 version of the HCPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics. At the visit the programme team acknowledged that this was a mistake. The education provider will therefore have to revisit their documentation to ensure that any reference to the HCPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics is an up to date version, to enable the resources to be effectively used and support student learning.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that the resources for practical teaching sessions are appropriate to effectively support the increase in student numbers.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors were shown a number of teaching and learning spaces including the library and the occupational therapy specialist teaching room. At the visit the programme team mentioned that there has been an increase in student numbers for this academic year (2016-2017) as a result of an increase in the recruitment of international students. The programme is currently approved for 20 students but the visitors noted at the visit that in the current academic year there are 27 students, and that the programme is proposing to increase to 40 students per year from next academic year. In the meetings with both the programme team and the students, the visitors were told that it was difficult to accommodate 27 students in their specialist occupational therapy skills teaching space. The programme team mentioned that they were addressing this issue with work arounds, which included double teaching and transporting the equipment for teaching specialist skills sessions to other teaching spaces in the university. However, the visitors did not see the alternative teaching spaces or the list of equipment which would be transported to these alternate teaching rooms, to be able to assess whether it was appropriate to support the teaching of practical sessions and whether these resources could accommodate an increase in student numbers. Furthermore, the education provider did not demonstrate that there were any long term solutions in place to show that there would be resources to support the increase in students. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that the resources to support student learning in practical teaching sessions are adequate to effectively support the increase in student numbers.

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 ensure that there is a formal processes in place to ensure that where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching sessions, appropriate protocols are used to obtain their consent.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the Equality impact assessment document and Programme handbook. From a review of the documentation submitted, the visitors could not identify any evidence to demonstrate how this standard was met. At the visit, the visitors were made aware by the students that they are verbally asked to give their consent, and understand their right to confidentiality when participating as service users in practical and clinical teaching sessions. However, the programme team told the visitors that there were no formal processes by which students would be able to give their consent when acting as service users in practical and clinical sessions. Furthermore, from these meetings the visitors could not see how students understood the potential risks of participating in these practical sessions. Although this programme is already approved, the visitors noted that they were unable to confirm that this standard was met with the information and evidence available to them. Therefore, the education provider will need to provide evidence of formal processes in place to ensure that where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching sessions, there are appropriate protocols used to obtain their consent.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how students and staff are clear about the assessment regulations, including any waivers, in relation to student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the programme specification, standard assessment regulations for the University of Bradford and a document with the exceptions (waivers) to these regulations. The visitors noted that the programme uses university-wide assessment regulations but that there are five exceptions (waivers) to these regulations around student progression and achievement which apply to certain modules. However, the visitors were unclear as to how these waivers work in practice in relation to student progression and achievement throughout the programme. For example, one of the waivers specifies that 'Modules of 40 and 60 credits incorporate multiple components of assessment with each component assigned a credit value.' However, the visitors did not see a breakdown of assessment or component credits within the modules, therefore they were unclear about which part of the modules these waivers would apply to. As such, the visitors could not see how students would be clear about how they progress and achieve within the programme, and how staff would be able to make consistent decisions in relation to student progression. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how students and staff are clear about the assessment regulations, including any waivers, in relation to student progression and achievement within the programme.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the programme documentation clearly articulates that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the University assessment regulations regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could not see in the assessment regulations or programme documentation where it clearly states that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors were also unclear on how the education provider ensures that students are aware of this. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the assessment regulations clearly specify that aegrotat award do not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

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 provide further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is from a relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to page 3 of the guide to external examining for taught programmes: chapter 3: criteria for appointment which states that external examiners must meet “applicable criteria set out by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies.” However, the visitors could not be certain from this evidence that this would mean that the HCPC standard would be met as it is not defined in the assessment regulations as to whether the external examiners would have to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register and, if not, that there is an appropriate reason for appointing an examiner who is not from the relevant part of the Register. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations for this programme specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is from a relevant part of the HCPC Register, and, if not, that there is an appropriate reason for appointing an examiner who is not from the relevant part of the Register.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that that the education provider informs the HCPC if the regulations differ from the proposed regulations approved by HCPC once they have gone through the education provider's internal validation process.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the programme specification, standard assessment regulations for the University of Bradford and a document with the exceptions (waivers) to these regulations. The visitors noted that the programme uses university-wide assessment regulations but that there are two exceptions (waivers) to these regulations around student progression and achievement which apply to certain modules. As the visitors are currently unclear about how these regulations will apply to this programme, the visitors are aware that the wording could change further once the waivers go through the education provider's validation process even after they may have been approved by the HCPC. As such, the visitors recommend that that they inform the HCPC if the regulations differ from the proposed regulations approved by HCPC.

Fleur Kitsell
Rebecca Khanna
Christine Morgan

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme name	MPhysio Sport and Exercise Medicine
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	18-20 January 2017

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	10

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 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 HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 13 March 2017 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 23 March 2017. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 27 March 2017. 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 25 May 2017.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC 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 the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and BSc (Hons) Occupational therapy. The education provider, the professional bodies and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) Rebecca Khanna (Occupational therapist) Christine Morgan (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah (Occupational therapy and Physiotherapy panel lead) Rebecca Stent (Diagnostic radiography panel lead)
Proposed student numbers	50 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2017
Chair	Josie Fraser (University of Bradford)
Secretary	Kirstin Bell (University of Bradford)
Members of the joint panel	Chakib Kara-Zaitri (Internal Panel Member) Ed Mallen (Internal Panel Member) Farah Shah (Student Panel Member) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational therapists) Jackie Taylor (College of Occupational therapists) Nina Paterson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Jacqueline Mullan (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)

	Isabella Sarapong (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Rebecca Sandys (Society of Radiographers) Ruth Strudwick (Society of Radiographers)
--	---

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC 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"/>

The HCPC did not review the External examiners' reports from the past two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

During the visit the HCPC 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"/>
Service users and carers	<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 HCPC met with students from the BSc Occupational therapy and BSc Physiotherapy programme, 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 satisfied 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 the relevant 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 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made one recommendation for the programme.

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

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 clarify who will pay for the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks, and how this will be communicated to applicants.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that no additional costs for students had been mentioned in the information for applicants such as the cost of DBS checks, despite the funding reforms which come into effect in September 2017. During the meeting with the students, the visitors were told that the education provider paid for the DBS checks. The programme team also agreed that they paid for the DBS checks, but they did mention that this may change for the 2017-2018 academic year. As such, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they let applicants know about the additional costs associated with the DBS checks.

2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate what the health requirements are, how appropriate they are to the content of the programme, and how students are told about these requirements

Reason: From a review of the admissions documentation available to applicants, the visitors noted that the education provider clearly outlines that, as part of fulfilling the entry requirements to be admitted onto the course, applicants must complete “an occupational health questionnaire and possible attendance at a medical appointment”, and this was confirmed by the students at the visit. Additionally during the student meeting at the visit, the students mentioned that they had to be vaccinated before they started on the programme. However, the visitors were unclear on what the health requirements were and where this information was made available to applicants. As the visitors did not know what the health requirements were they could not determine whether these requirements were appropriate to the content of the programme and could also not determine how the relevant health checks are carried out and processed as part of the admissions process. The education provider therefore needs to provide evidence which clearly outlines the health requirements for the programme to applicants, the appropriateness to the content of the programme and how students are told about these health requirements.

3.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that with the proposed increase in student numbers across the physiotherapy provision, there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the staff curriculum vitae. The visitors were told that the MPhysio academics will also teach on the BSc Physiotherapy

programme. At the visit, the visitors were told that the education provider will no longer run the sports rehabilitation programme and the staff members for this programme will now teach on the proposed MPhysio programme. The visitors were also told that the education provider would be recruiting a grade 9 lecturer for the programme. Furthermore, the education provider expressed that there is a work load model which helps manage the staff members' workloads and identify areas where they may need support. The visitors noted that the number of staff highlighted in the programme documentation was adequate for the proposed student numbers (50 students). The visitors, however, did not receive any evidence of formal plans in place to demonstrate when the new member of staff will be recruited or how they will ensure there will be an adequate number of staff across the physiotherapy provision to deliver the programmes effectively, with the increase in student numbers and the additional commitments of the staff team. Furthermore the visitors are unclear on how the work load model will ensure that there is an adequate number of staff to deliver the programme effectively. The visitors will therefore need to see evidence of formal plans in place and timelines for the recruitment of this new staff member. Additionally, the visitors will need to see formal plans in place which demonstrates how the additional commitments of the staff team will be managed to ensure that there is an appropriate number of qualified and experienced staff for the programme.

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: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the range of placements is appropriate for the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors were not clear about what the range of placements would be. At the visit the programme team mentioned that they 'anticipate that two of the five placements would be in a non-musculoskeletal setting'. As the visitors were unclear through the documentation and the visit what the range of practice placements would be they could not determine whether the range of placements would be sufficient to deliver the programme and achieve the learning outcomes. As such the education provider would need to demonstrate how the range of placements including both musculoskeletal and non-musculoskeletal placements are appropriate for the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how students and staff are clear about the assessment regulations, including any waivers, in relation to student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the programme specification, standard assessment regulations for the University of Bradford and a document with the exceptions (waivers) to these regulations. The visitors noted that the programme uses university-wide assessment regulations but that there are five exceptions (waivers) to these regulations around student progression and achievement which apply to certain modules. However, the visitors were unclear as to how these waivers work in practice in relation to student progression and achievement throughout

the programme. For example, one of the waivers specifies that 'All students undertaking modules of 40 and 60 credits will undertake units of assessment over the academic year. Each unit of assessment will be assigned an equivalent credit value.' However, the visitors did not see a breakdown of assessment or component credits within the modules, therefore they were unclear about which part of the modules these waivers would apply to. As such, the visitors could not see how students would be clear about how they progress and achieve within the programme, and how staff would be able to make consistent decisions in relation to student progression. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how students and staff are clear about the assessment regulations, including any waivers, in relation to student progression and achievement within the programme.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the programme documentation clearly articulates that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the University assessment regulations regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could not see in the assessment regulations or programme documentation where it clearly states that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors were also unclear on how the education provider ensures that students are aware of this. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the assessment regulations clearly specify that aegrotat award do not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

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 provide further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is from a relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to page 3 of the guide to external examining for taught programmes: chapter 3: criteria for appointment which states that external examiners must meet "applicable criteria set out by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies." However, the visitors could not be certain from this evidence that this would mean that the HCPC standard would be met as it is not defined in the assessment regulations as to whether the external examiners would have to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register and, if not, that there is an appropriate reason for appointing an examiner who is not from the relevant part of the Register. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations for this programme specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is from a relevant part of the HCPC Register, and, if not, that there is an appropriate reason for appointing an examiner who is not from the relevant part of the Register.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that that the education provider informs the HCPC if the regulations differ from the proposed regulations approved by HCPC once they have gone through the education provider's internal validation process.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the programme specification, standard assessment regulations for the University of Bradford and a document with the exceptions (waivers) to these regulations. The visitors noted that the programme uses university-wide assessment regulations but that there are five exceptions (waivers) to these regulations around student progression and achievement which apply to certain modules. As the visitors are currently unclear about how these regulations will apply to this programme, the visitors are aware that the wording could change further once the waivers go through the education provider's validation process even after they may have been approved by the HCPC. As such, the visitors recommend that that they inform the HCPC if the regulations differ from the proposed regulations approved by HCPC.

Fleur Kitsell
Rebecca Khanna
Christine Morgan

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	St Georges University of London and Kingston University
Awarding body	St Georges University of London
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	13-14 December 2016

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 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 HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 8 February 2017 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 23 March 2017. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 3 April 2017. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 May 2017.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC 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 validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC 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 HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC'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 and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist) Joanne Stead (Occupational therapist) Roseann Connolly (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
HCPC observer	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	20 per cohort, per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2017
Chair	Rachel Allen
Secretary	Derek Baldwinson
Members of the joint panel	Catherine Dakin (Internal Panel Member) Karen Elcock (Internal Panel Member) Heather Hunter (External Panel Member) Patricia McClure (College of Occupational Therapists) Lyn Westcott (College of Occupational Therapists) Clair Parkin (College of Occupational Therapists) Maureen Shiells (College of Occupational Therapists)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC 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"/>

The HCPC 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 HCPC 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"/>
Service users and carers	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme at the education provider, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it as it is not approved.

The HCPC did not see the occupational therapy facilities as they had not yet been built.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be satisfied 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 the relevant part of the Register.

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 39 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 19 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Conditions

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 provide evidence of the named person who will have overall responsibility for the programme, and ensure that named person is appropriately qualified and experienced.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided that the education provider had not yet recruited the person who will have the overall responsibility for the programme. During the visit, the education provider confirmed that they had not yet recruited for this role. The visitors therefore need to see evidence of the named person when recruited, to assess whether they are appropriately qualified and experienced to lead the programme.

3.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff, to demonstrate that the programme will be effectively delivered.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the education provider outlined the staff profiles for the Department of Rehabilitation Sciences where the occupational therapy programme will be situated. At the visit the education provider stated that they will be recruiting three full time occupational therapy lecturers, one being the professional lead and two being senior lectures. During the programme team meeting, the education provider mentioned that they plan to have a professional lead in place by March 2017, as they have interviews lined up in January 2017. The professional lead will then help with the recruitment of the senior lecturers. The visitors were unclear of the qualifications and experience that will be required of successful candidates, and are therefore unclear that the staff team would have the required range of experience to deliver an effective programme. As such, the visitors need to be assured there is a formal plan in place to recruit appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that subject areas are taught by staff with the specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: From a review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to determine if subject areas will be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. The documentation included staff CVs and descriptions of the modules. However, from the CVs received the visitors noted that only one member of programme team was an occupational therapist. In the documentation and at the visit the education provider informed us that they will be recruiting three more occupational therapy lecturers, including one that will be the professional lead for the programme. However, as they have not yet been recruited, the visitors are unable to conclude whether these

individuals will have relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. The visitors will need to be assured that there will be a sufficient mix of skills, knowledge and experience to deliver this programme. Additionally, it is not clear to the visitors which member of staff will be responsible for each module. In order to determine that this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates that the staff who deliver the programme will have the relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that they will have physical resources in place to support student learning before the planned start date for the programme, and that these resources will be effectively used by the programme.

Reason: At the visit the visitors were shown existing teaching facilities, the paramedic suite, and the St George's University Library. The education provider has not yet built the occupational therapy facilities, so the visitors were shown the paramedic suite instead, to demonstrate that they have built specialist teaching facilities for another professional group. The visitors were also shown the designated teaching spaces for the occupational therapy programme but there was no equipment in this space, and the planned layout for the space itself had not been finalised. In the documentation, the education provider outlined that following internal approval and tendering process of the new facilities, they would aim to build the facilities in summer 2017 ready for the 2017-18 intake. Furthermore, the education provider has an 'architectural interim strategy', in the event that there are delays in building the new facilities to this timescale. In the case where the facilities are not built before the first cohort arrive the education provider will hire off-site facilities. They have had "preliminary discussions regarding sessions and timings" with Queen Elizabeth Foundation, a lodge with an independent living unit. Nonetheless, there was no formal documentary evidence of what the on-site space would look like once it had been refurbished and no formal plans of how the specialist occupational therapy facilities would be set up. Additionally, with the Queen Elizabeth Foundation facilities, there are currently no formal arrangements in place to secure the facilities should the programme team need to. Due to this, the visitors are unclear as to whether there will be resources to support student learning, and how these resources will be effectively used. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that they will have physical resources in place to support student learning before the planned start date for the programme, are appropriate to support the learning and teaching activities of the programme and that these resources are effectively used by the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the library resources effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the resource and definitive document, and at the visit they were taken on a tour of the library facilities. In the documentation the visitors could not see what texts would be available to the students. From the tour the visitors noted that the texts that would be available for students on the occupational therapy programme were limited and outdated. During the library presentation, the visitors were told that there will be a number of books bought to

support student learning on the programme. However, the visitors did not receive formal confirmation of a commitment to acquire library resources. The visitors noted that the current library resources are not adequate to support the required learning and teaching activities of this programme and no formal arrangements in place to ensure that these resources are sufficient before the students start the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that there will be adequate library facilities to support the required learning and teaching activities of this programme, or a commitment to acquiring appropriate resources before the intended start date of September 2017.

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 communicate any changes to the programme learning outcomes, and demonstrate that these ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for occupational therapists.

Reason: When the visitors reviewed the documentation prior to the visit they were satisfied that the current learning outcomes for the programme ensure that those who successfully complete the programme will meet the standards of proficiency for occupational therapists. However, during the informal feedback meeting at the visit it was stated that the College of Occupational Therapists and the internal validation panel will require the programme team to change several learning outcomes. The visitors will therefore require the education provider to communicate any changes to the learning outcomes once made, so they can make a judgement about whether those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for occupational therapists.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the programme reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base of occupational therapy, beyond the biomedical approaches to care.

Reason: From the documentation provided and during the visit, the visitors noted that there was a lack of integration of psycho-social understanding throughout the programme. The visitors could not identify how the programme was occupationally focused. The visitors highlighted that there was more of an emphasis on the biomedical approaches to care and this emphasis was reflected in the documentation and during the visit. For example, in the documentation, the visitors noted that the equipment list, reading list and module descriptors reflected the biomedical approach. In discussions with the senior and programme team about the practical facilities to be developed and placements identified, the visitors were unable to see how the programme reflected psycho-social understanding throughout the programme. The visitors therefore, were unable to see how the curriculum content reflects the full philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base of occupational therapy. The education provider will therefore need to provide further evidence to demonstrate that the curriculum reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base of occupational therapy beyond the biomedical approaches to care.

4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they use appropriate learning and teaching methods to ensure the effective delivery of creative approaches to care within the curriculum.

Reason: The documentation provided included information about the range of learning and teaching approaches that will be used by the programme team across the duration of the programme. During the visit, the education provider told the visitors what the teaching approaches will be. However, the visitors were unclear on how the learning methods are appropriate for the effective delivery of creative approaches to care within the curriculum. This is because the visitors could not see how problem solving, creative thinking skills, and creative ways of working with people (for example through drama, art, music and dance) would be taught. The visitors therefore, noted that the range of learning and teaching approaches were not appropriate to teach creative approaches to care. The visitors therefore, require evidence to demonstrate how the range of learning and teaching approaches used is appropriate to effectively deliver the creative approaches to care within the curriculum.

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that occupational therapy specific skills and knowledge will be adequately addressed in the interprofessional learning sessions.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that there are various modules across the years where occupational therapy students will learn interprofessionally with other professional groups, such as radiographers. In assessing the curriculum for the interprofessional learning modules, the visitors were unable to determine how the teaching would be contextualised for occupational therapy students, or how more specific occupational therapy skills and knowledge will be addressed. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learned that there was an emphasis on the physiotherapy profession within interprofessional learning sessions, and this was particularly evident within the Inter-professional Foundation module in year one, due to the focus on physiology. The visitors therefore, require evidence to demonstrate that occupational therapy specific skills and knowledge is adequately addressed in the interprofessional sessions.

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that there are formal arrangements in place to secure practice placements for all students.

Reason: During the programme team meeting the education provider identified a number of partner organisations and in the documentation, identified where they would like the students to undertake practice placements. The education provider told the visitors that they have had informal conversations with these placement providers, who have made verbal commitments to take students from this programme. The programme team stated that they were working towards securing formal agreements with the placement providers. However, the visitors note that without seeing the agreements,

they are unable to make a judgment about whether placements are integral to the programme for all students. Furthermore, the education provider considered that they could fit into a regional placement allocation model, but it was not clear how this model would adapt to other education providers' provision and if the number of placements required will be impacted. The visitors therefore require evidence of the formal arrangements to secure practice placements for all students.

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: The education provider must outline the range of practice placements that will be available to students on this programme, and must ensure that they are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: From the scrutiny of the documentation, and from discussions at the visit, the visitors were unable to see any formal arrangements in place to demonstrate that there would be an appropriate range of practice placements, which would be available to students on this programme. The programme team discussed the range of placements that could be appropriate to support this programme, such as role emerging, acute hospital and rehabilitation placements. However, the placements discussed were not formally agreed by the placement providers and the education provider. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgement on the range of practice placements being appropriate to support the number of students. The visitors therefore require documentation which clearly outlines the range of placements available for students on the programme and that they are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that all placements provide a safe and supportive environment for students.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed the definitive document, the resource document and various sections of the practice placement handbook. In the practice placement handbook, as part of the quality assurance measures of placements, the education provider undertakes an audit prior to the students going to the placement. According to the documentation, new placements are audited through the 'new placement information checklist' and placements are also audited on a yearly basis. The programme team told the visitors that placements are audited before students are placed, and the visitors were then shown an audit form for placements at the visit. Although there is a process in place for auditing placements, the visitors were not satisfied that this process is robust enough to ensure that all practice placement settings will offer a safe and supportive environment for students. The visitors noted that there was no place in the audit document to record placement provider policies about health and safety, for example. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how the education provider would be able to make judgements about whether such policies are reasonable through their audit process. The visitors will therefore need to see further evidence of policies and procedures in place to demonstrate how they ensure that all placements provide a safe and supportive environment.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate how they maintain a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the definitive document, resource document and the practice placement handbook. In the documentation the visitors noted that as part of the education provider's quality assurance processes they would undertake an audit prior to the approval of the placement through the 'new placement information checklist' and the placements would then be monitored on a yearly basis by the Department of Rehabilitation. Additionally, at the visit, the programme team showed the visitors a form that would be used to audit placements before students were placed. Although the education provider has a process to audit placements, the visitors noted that the evidence gathered via this process was not sufficient to thoroughly and effectively approve and monitor all placements. The visitors were unclear of how the criteria is used to approve placement providers and settings, the overall process for the approval and on-going monitoring of placements, and how information gathered from placement providers at approval, or during a placement experience, is considered and acted upon. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the overarching policies, systems and procedures in place regarding the approval and monitoring of placements, and how they are put into practice to ensure this standard is met.

5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: : The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that all placements have equality and diversity policies in relation to students and how it will implemented and monitored.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed the definitive document, the resource document and various sections of the practice placement handbook. In the practice placement handbook, as part of the quality assurance measures of placements, the education provider undertakes an audit prior to the students going to the placement. According to the documentation, new placements are audited through the 'new placement information checklist' and placements are also audited on a yearly basis. The programme team told the visitors that placements are audited before students are placed, and the visitors were then shown an audit form for placements at the visit. However, after scrutinising the evidence, the visitors could not see how the criteria against which placements will be audited will ensure that the practice placement settings will have equality and diversity policies that will be effectively implemented and monitored. The visitors noted that there was no place in the audit document to record placement provider policies about equality and diversity. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how the education provider would be able to make judgements about whether such policies are reasonable through their audit process. The visitors will therefore need to see further evidence of policies and procedures in place to demonstrate how they ensure that all placements ensure that equality and diversity policies in relation to students are in place and effectively implemented and monitored.

5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that an effective and consistent audit system is in place for placement settings to ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. In the documentation and at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider uses the 'New placement information checklist' form for approving placements as a means of ensuring that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement setting. From the information provided, the visitors were unclear about how the education provider's policies would determine whether all placements would have an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is met.

5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. In the documentation and at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider uses the 'New placement information checklist' form for approving placements as a means of ensuring that placement educators have the appropriate skills and knowledge. From the information provided, the visitors were unclear about how the education provider's policies would determine whether all placement educators would have the relevant skills, knowledge and experience. As such, the visitors require further evidence to ensure that the audit process effectively ensure that the practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the definitive document and practice placement handbook. In the practice placement handbook, as part of the quality assurance measures of placements, the education provider undertakes an audit prior to the students going to the placement. According to the documentation, placements are also audited on a yearly basis. The programme team told the visitors in the meeting that placements are audited before students are placed, and the visitors were then shown an audit form for placements at the visit. The visitors noted that there is a process in place for auditing. Furthermore, the placement handbook highlights that the education provider will offer free study days for both experienced and new practice educators and "all educators are advised to attend before supervising students for the first time". Practice educators may also get involved in the College of Occupational

Therapy Accreditation of Practice Placement Educator (APPLE) scheme if they choose. However, from the evidence and the discussions at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine whether the education provider requires that practice placement educators undertake appropriate training. Although the practice educators are 'advised' to attend these study day training sessions it is not compulsory to do so and neither is the APPLE training scheme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators undertake appropriate training for their role as practice educators.

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 further evidence to demonstrate how students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators will be fully prepared for placement.

Reason: The visitors were referred to the placement handbook and definitive documents in the evidence provided for this standard. However, on considering the evidence, and from discussions at the approval visit, the visitors could not determine how students, practice placement providers and educators will be fully prepared for placement. The visitors could not locate any policies in the evidence where, the education provider outlines the communication and lines of responsibility for placements. The visitors could not see how the education provider will provide information, and how they ensure that all those involved have understood the information. In order to determine that this standard is met, the visitors will need to see evidence to show that there is a system in place to ensure that students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators, will have a clear understanding of what is expected of them at practice placements.

5.13 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that policies about service users and carers within the practice placements respect the rights and needs of service users and carers and are adhered to by students.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the resource document and the practice placement handbook. The evidence the visitors reviewed in the placement handbook specified that students must always ensure that they identify themselves as a student when they first meet a service user and gain their consent before "undertaking an assessment/ intervention activity". The education provider has

also highlighted in the documentation that “students must be familiar and comply with the placement provider’s policy on gaining consent”. The visitors however, noted there could be inconsistencies in placement provider policies around service users and carers, or these policies may not exist, depending on where the placement is. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that there are consistent policies to ensure the rights and needs of service users and carers are respected within practice placements settings and are also adhered to by students.

Angela Ariu
Joanne Stead
Roseann Connolly