

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Approval visit date	17 - 18 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-12034-Q8L6Z0

### Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation .....	8

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Anthony Power	Physiotherapist
Ian Hughes	Lay
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

### Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Claire Alfrey	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Canterbury Christ Church University
Lauren Smyth	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Canterbury Christ Church University
Claire Anderson	Internal panel member	Canterbury Christ Church University

Shola Osinaike	Internal panel member	Canterbury Christ Church University
Rebekah Osbourne	Learner member, internal panel	Canterbury Christ Church University
Sarah Crowther	External member of internal panel	Sheffield Hallam University
Steve Ryall	Professional body member	Education advisor, Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Nina Paterson	Professional body member	Education advisor, Chartered Society of Physiotherapy

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
Proposed first intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01757

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

## Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes

Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Not Required

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met	
Learners	Yes	The programme is not running yet so we met with learners from the existing HCPC-approved BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice education providers	Yes	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	
Facilities and resources	Yes	

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

### Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

### Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 15 June 2018

### **2.1 The admissions process 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 ensure that applicants have access to all necessary information required to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, in the programme specification, which included descriptions for applicants of the application process, and information about the various requirements and prerequisites for entry to the programme. From this information, they understood that some of the placements were a considerable distance from the main programme site and so learners might incur

significant extra costs associated with travel or accommodation. They could not see in this evidence where applicants would find clear information about the costs that they might incur during practice-based learning. From the meeting with learners from existing programmes, the visitors were aware that for other HCPC-approved programmes the materials available for applicants gave approximate indications of the costs associated with different placements. However, the visitors could not determine how applicants to this programme would have access to information regarding associated costs. The visitors could not see where applicants were given full details about the specific contents and process of the occupational health check. Discussions with the senior team and programme team did not clarify how applicants might access information about potential costs and the occupational health check at an appropriate point in the application process, before applicants would make a decision about whether to accept an offer. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that all applicants are provided with timely information about the nature of the occupational health check and the extra costs that they are likely to incur on placement.

### **3.11 An effective programme must be in place to ensure the continuing professional and academic development of educators, appropriate to their role in the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clarify what programme of professional and academic development is available to visiting lecturers that is appropriate to their role on the programme and effective at ensuring their skills are up to date.

**Reason:** The visitors were not able to review documentary evidence for this standard but did discuss staff development opportunities with the programme team and the senior team. They were satisfied from these discussions that there was an effective programme in place to ensure the development of permanent staff, and that the education provider had systems in place for monitoring and recording the academic and professional development of permanent employees. The visitors also reviewed a copy of the Faculty of Health and Wellbeing Research & Knowledge Exchange Newsletter. However, regarding visiting lecturers, the visitors were unclear about how the education provider ensured that such staff were keeping their skills up to date. There did not seem to be a written record of this. They considered that, due to the structure of the programme and its reliance on visiting lecturers, it was especially important for the education provider to have a way of ensuring that these lecturers were accessing continuing development appropriate to their role. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating that they can do so.

### **3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that the programme documentation is accurate in its references to HCPC requirements.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the programme specification and the programme and placement handbooks. They noted that the programme specification stated that the HCPC required physiotherapy learners to complete 1,000 hours of practice-based learning before they were eligible to apply for registration. This is not the case; the HCPC does not set out such requirements. The visitors therefore require the education provider to amend this part of the programme specification.

### **5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that all educators in practice-based learning are appropriately trained before learners are placed with them.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the practice handbook. It consisted of a description of the role and responsibilities of the practice educator, but did not make clear the training requirements that practice educators would have to meet prior to working with learners on the programme. The mapping document referred to practice educator training days, but this did not link to any specific evidence regarding these training days. The visitors discussed practice educator training with the programme team and the practice placement providers, and they received verbal assurances that practice educators were expected to undergo training before supervising learners. However, they could not see anywhere in the programme documentation a clear statement that all practice educators must undertake appropriate training before they can supervise learners or how they ensure that all practice educators have completed the training. As such, they were unable to be certain that the standard was met. They therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing how they will ensure that all practice educators undergo appropriate training, specific to their role, before supervising learners.

### **6.3 Assessments must provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they will manage the moderation of assessment for learners on placement to ensure that it is as fair as possible.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard, in the programme specification and on the education provider's website. From this evidence and from discussions with the programme team, they were not clear how the education provider would ensure that moderation of assessment in practice-based learning would provide a fair measure of learners' achievement. They were aware that the education provider had chosen to use a 20 per cent sampling rate for termly moderation, but they considered that on a programme which would only have 20 learners per cohort this would mean a low level of moderation. There was a risk that assessment which was not fair or reliable would not be picked up by this method. The visitors were particularly concerned about two potential problems in assessment that might not be picked up by this moderation strategy:

- Fairness around the pass / fail borderline for practice-based learning placements. It was not clear to the visitors how the education provider could ensure that the judgements by practice educators concerning whether a learner had passed a placement were as fair as possible
- Whether any particular assessor was assessing work appropriately – with only a 20 per cent sampling rate an assessor might easily go for some time without having their work moderated.

The programme team stated that alongside the sampling method, they were also looking to use team assessment strategies where possible, for example in large clinical settings. However, not all practice based learning takes place in such settings; some learners would be placed in settings with only one or two supervisors, which would mean that the potential issues outlined above might still arise. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that their moderation of assessment carried out by practice educators will be objective, fair and reliable.

### **Recommendations**

We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

#### **3.5 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should continue to develop its methods for maintaining regular and effective collaboration with practice education providers.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied that the standard was met at threshold, as the programme team and practice placement providers had explained in meetings how collaboration between them worked. There are regular meetings and long-standing professional relationships in place. However, the visitors were not clear about how and where discussions about assessment on placement had taken place. There did not seem to be a record of such meetings. They therefore suggest to the education provider that they review how best to maintain clear records of these discussions so that collaboration continues to be effective.

#### **3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should continue its planned development of use of service users and carer involvement across the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied that the standard was met at threshold, as there was an active service users' group which worked closely with staff in the School of Allied Health Professions, in which this programme is placed. Service users and carers will be contributing to teaching and admissions on the programme. The visitors noted that the service users' group did seem to be relatively small, and that there were plans for them to be involved more widely and systematically in the programme in the future. They suggest that the education provider carry forward these plans to broaden and strengthen the service user and carer involvement, and to review which parts of the programme are most appropriate for their involvement. In this way they will continue to ensure that service users and carers contribute to the programme's overall quality and effectiveness.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 August 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).