

## Visitors' report

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Name of education provider</b>    | Queen Margaret University                                 |
| <b>Programme name</b>                | Post Graduate Diploma<br>Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) |
| <b>Mode of delivery</b>              | Full time   |
| <b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b> | Physiotherapist   |
| <b>Date of visit</b>                 | 12 – 13 April 2011  |

## Contents

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| Contents .....            | 1 |
| Executive summary .....   | 2 |
| Introduction.....         | 3 |
| Visit details .....       | 3 |
| Sources of evidence ..... | 5 |
| Recommended outcome ..... | 6 |
| Recommendations.....      | 7 |

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' or 'Physical therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme at the education provider. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 7 July 2011. At this meeting, the Committee confirmed the ongoing approval of the programme. This means that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), full time and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, full time. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession                     | Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)<br>Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)  |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)                | Mandy Hargood  |
| Proposed student numbers                                | 40 across the MSc and Post Graduate Diploma  |
| First approved intake                                   | September 2009   |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2011   |
| Chair   | Dr Lindesay Irvine (Queen Margaret University)   |
| Secretary   | Craig Rutherford (Queen Margaret University)   |
| Members of the joint panel                              | Joe Goldblatt (Internal Panel Member)<br>Sara Smith (Internal Panel Member)<br>Jo White (Internal Panel Member)<br>Julia Dixon Phillip (Internal Panel Member)<br>Jennifer Duthie (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)<br>Nina Paterson (Chartered Society of |

|  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
|  | Physiotherapists) |
|--|-------------------|

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

|  | Yes                                 | No                       | N/A                      |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme specification  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Descriptions of the modules  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

|   | Yes                                 | No                       | N/A                      |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Learning resources  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation<br>(eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors did not set any conditions for the programme.

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

The visitors have made a recommendation for the programme.

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme.

Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Recommendations

### **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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider including updates on an annual basis for basic life support skills for the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors were content that this standard was met. The visitors were also content that basic life support skills such as cardiopulmonary resuscitation techniques would be taught on the programme to ensure that the students were ready for the first placement as indicated in the programme documentation received prior to the visit. However the visitors felt that to give the students further opportunity to enhance their skills in basic life support, the programme team should consider providing annual updates in this area. During the meeting with the programme team the programme leader commented that whilst in the current programme structure the students are given basic life support skills prior to going out on the first placement, they would consider the introduction of further basic life support skills throughout the revised programme to enhance how this standard continues to be met.

Anthony Power  
Joanna Jackson