



EUROPEAN REGION

World Confederation
for Physical Therapy

Report on the Follow Up and Recommendations Regarding the Implementation of the “European Physiotherapy Benchmark Statement”

ADOPTED at the
General Meeting 27-29 May 2010
Berlin, Germany

**FOLLOW UP REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE “EUROPEAN PHYSIOTHERAPY BENCHMARK
STATEMENT”**

**European Region of the World Confederation for Physical Therapy (WCPT)
Education Matters WG**

The Education Working Group carried out a follow-up survey on the implementation of the European Physiotherapy Benchmark Statement (EPBS), adopted in the final version at the Extraordinary General Meeting in Barcelona 2003. It was agreed that the questionnaire previously used would be circulated to allow comparison with data presented in 2006 AND 2008. The questionnaire was distributed to all 35 Member Organisations (MO's) and 22 replies were received (Table 1). The return rate was thus 63%.

Table 1

Replying Member Organisations in 2004	Replying Member Organisations in 2006	Replying Member Organisations in 2008	Replying Organisations in 2009
Austria	Austria	Czech Republic	Austria
Cyprus	Cyprus	Denmark	Belgium
Denmark	Denmark	Estonia	Bulgaria
Germany	Estonia	Italy	Cyprus
Iceland	Germany	Luxembourg	Czech Republic
Ireland	Greece	Norway	Denmark
Liechtenstein	Italy	Spain	Estonia
The Netherlands	Liechtenstein		Finland
Norway	Norway		France
Portugal	Poland		Germany
Sweden	Spain		Israel
	Sweden		Latvia
			Lebanon
			Liechtenstein
			Malta
			Netherlands
			Norway
			Poland
			Spain
			Sweden
			Turkey
			UK

Of the 22 respondents, 16 (73%) have promoted the EPBS widely amongst their members whilst 12 (55%) have informed their relevant education interest groups. It is also of note that 17 (77%) have made their physiotherapy schools aware, 9 (41%) have made the relevant competent authorities aware, whilst 7 report that the National Agency for Quality Assessment is aware. As twelve of the respondents had previously replied these results reflect and build upon previous knowledge.

Ten of the Member Organisations had translated the EPBS into their national whilst a further three Member Organisations report work in progress regarding translation of the EPBS at present. Six MO's reported that they had not translated the EPBS.

Two MO's reported a decision not to introduce National Specifications whilst 3 have decided to introduce them and 6 are as yet undecided. A further 7 MO's hve not had the opportunity to initiate discussions at a national level.

It should be noted that there were no suggestions for amendments to the EPBS in this survey.

Conclusions

The present report reflects responses from 63% of the Member Organisations and thus gives a good indication of the extent of implementation of the European Physiotherapy Benchmark Statement in Europe. Although a number of the replying countries are the same as in previous surveys, it is still not a complete overlap, and this combined with the increased response rate allows a n opportunity to monitor the progress in terms of implementation.

No responding Member Organisations indicated a need to amend the EPBS, although discussion at both the General Meeting in 2008, and within the education matters working group suggest that for many countries the EPBS is still valid and of use, whilst elsewhere it now lacks a contemporary use,

Although a positive attitude towards the EPBS seems to prevail, it is plausible that it takes time to fully implement such a policy development.

Recommendations

1. No further updating of the Benchmark Statement based on the following assumptions:
 - The EPBS was developed before the Bologna process and it would be difficult to align the document with the process. The EPBS does not have the same language use for the European Qualification Framework (EQF)
 - The EPBS does not show the Physiotherapy profession as a science health discipline
 - The EPBS is a dated document and does not have a vision about the future of the profession.
2. The Benchmark Statement should remain accessible and as a reference document aligned with more contemporary documents.
3. No further monitoring of the implementation of the Benchmark Statement.