

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Education provider | Anglia Ruskin University |
| Name of programme(s) | MA Dramatherapy, Full time |
| Date submission received | 29 June 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15499-V0X5K5 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation..... | 3 |

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|------------------|----------------------------------|
| Belinda Sherlock | Arts therapist - Dramatherapist |
| Donald Wetherick | Arts therapist - Music therapist |
| Rabie Sultan | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| Programme name | MA Dramatherapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Arts therapist |
| Modality | Drama therapy |
| First intake | 01 September 2010 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09055 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|------------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | The University of Bolton |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time Degree Apprenticeship for Operating Department Practitioners - Level 6, Flexible |
| Date submission received | 04 May 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15524-P5J3R8 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| Joanne Thomas | Operating department practitioner |
| Joanna Finney | Operating department practitioner |
| Niall Gooch | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Operating department practitioner |
| First intake | 01 January 2019 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM09082 |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Programme name | Degree Apprenticeship for Operating Department Practitioners - Level 6 |
| Mode of study | FLX (Flexible) |
| Profession | Operating department practitioner |

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------|
| First intake | 01 January 2019 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM09083 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 | Reason(s) for non-submission |
|--|-----------|--|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes | |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | N/A | Only one year of documentation available as the programme only started in January 2019 |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | N/A | Only one year of documentation available as the programme only started in January 2019 |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | N/A | Only one year of documentation available as the programme only started in January 2019 |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | N/A | Only one year of documentation available as the programme only started in January 2019 |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | N/A | Only one year of documentation available as the programme only started in January 2019 |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that on their audit form the education provider had stated that the total learner numbers were 34. The visitors were not clear what this referred to, i.e. whether it meant that there were 34 learners in total across both the BSc (Hons) and the degree apprenticeship, or whether each programme had 34 learners, or whether each cohort of the programme was admitting that many learners. Additionally the visitors noted that in one part of the documentation it was indicated that there were 22 learners on the apprenticeship pathway and only one learner on the traditional route. Elsewhere in their mapping document, the education provider referred to increases in learner numbers requiring significant additional staffing. However, it was not clear to the learners what exactly this increase in learner numbers was, or in which of the programmes. They therefore require the education provider to clarify this so that a determination can be made about whether the governance, resources and staffing are appropriate, and whether the process for securing sufficient capacity and availability in placement continues to be appropriate.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to clarify how many learners are on each programme and how many have been admitted in each cohort, and the details of how the extra staff have been deployed.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider | Cardiff University |
| Name of programme(s) | Doctorate in Educational Psychology (DEdPsy), Full time |
| Date submission received | 15 May 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15155-K4D8D3 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Jacqueline Garland | Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist |
| Lisa Marks Woolfson | Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist |
| Niall Gooch | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Doctorate in Educational Psychology (DEdPsy) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Educational psychologist |
| First intake | 01 January 2005 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09093 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|------------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: The visitors noted that new activities had been developed in order to address SET 3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme. However, no changes were recorded in the mapping document as having been made to ensure SET 3.4 is still met, following the addition of these new elements to the programme. The visitors were unclear from the evidence provided, how monitoring and evaluation of service user and carer involvement are carried out, what systems have been set up to obtain feedback from stakeholders regarding service user and carer involvement, and what plans the education provider has for developing this further.

Additional evidence: Evidence of the education provider's monitoring, evaluation and action planning process with respect to service user involvement in the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider | Cardiff University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Full time |
| Date submission received | 16 April 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15160-N0T1R8 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Beverley Ball | Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer |
| Kathryn Burgess | Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer |
| Niall Gooch | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Radiographer |
| Modality | Therapeutic radiographer |
| First intake | 01 September 2007 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 23 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09098 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted that the School of Health Sciences had been restructured with professional heads being appointed following expressions of interest from staff members from that section of the professional register. A role descriptor for the post was submitted, but not a description of the process for replacing the programme leader appropriately if it became necessary to do so. Consequently, the visitors were unable to assess if the education provider has an appropriate process for ensuring an appointee is appropriately qualified and experienced.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates what would be the process for the appointment of a future head of therapeutic radiography which could include the person

specification, what would be the recruitment process and if necessary the expression of interest process.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider | City, University of London |
| Name of programme(s) | Independent and Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing Programme (V300), Part time |
| Date submission received | 31 March 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15525-H1L3F5 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Rosemary Furner | Independent prescriber |
| Pradeep Agrawal | Biomedical scientist |
| Niall Gooch | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Independent and Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing Programme (V300) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM09101 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

B.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the register of their statutory regulator.

Reason: The education provider submitted a job description in their evidence for this standard. The visitors review this job description, and considered that on its own it did not constitute sufficient evidence that there was a suitable process in place to ensure that an appropriate replacement programme lead could be appointed if it became necessary to do so. As the education provider had not had to meet this standard before, the visitors considered that it was particularly important for them to see evidence of how the recruitment process worked.

The visitors also noted that the job description appeared to have a strong nursing focus, including a requirement that the programme lead should be a nurse. While this was not a problem from the HCPC perspective, the visitors considered that as part of their

response the education provider should demonstrate how they will ensure that the programme lead will be enabled and supported to provide appropriate oversight for non-nursing allied health professionals.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate what process the education provider will use to appoint a suitable new programme lead if it becomes necessary to do so, including how the education provider will ensure that the programme lead is enabled or supported to provide appropriate oversight for allied health professionals.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider | City, University of London |
| Name of programme(s) | Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology, Full time |
| Date submission received | 30 June 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15532-S0F6Y2 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation..... | 3 |

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| David Packwood | Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist |
| Garrett Kennedy | Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist |
| John Archibald | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Counselling psychologist |
| First intake | 01 January 2005 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09103 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|------------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Cardiff Metropolitan University |
| Name of programme(s) | Doctorate in Forensic Psychology, Full time Doctorate in Forensic Psychology, Part time Post Graduate Diploma in Practitioner Forensic Psychology, Full time Post Graduate Diploma in Practitioner Forensic Psychology, Part time |
| Date submission received | 26 June 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15165-G7W5F1 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation..... | 4 |

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Shola Apena Rogers | Practitioner psychologist - Forensic psychologist |
| Sally Evans | Practitioner psychologist - Forensic psychologist |
| Rabie Sultan | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Programme name | Doctorate in Forensic Psychology |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Forensic psychologist |
| First intake | 01 September 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 7 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09114 |

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Programme name | Doctorate in Forensic Psychology |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Forensic psychologist |
| First intake | 01 September 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 7 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09115 |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Post Graduate Diploma in Practitioner Forensic Psychology |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Forensic psychologist |
| First intake | 01 September 2011 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09119 |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Post Graduate Diploma in Practitioner Forensic Psychology |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Forensic psychologist |
| First intake | 01 September 2011 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09120 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HPCP annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |

| | |
|--|-----|
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Edge Hill University |
| Name of programme(s) | Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 6), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 7), Part time |
| Date submission received | 20 April 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15171-L3Q8J4 |

Contents

| | |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 4 |
| Section 5: Visitors' recommendation..... | 4 |
| Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)..... | 4 |

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 annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 6 of this report.

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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Rosemary Furner | Independent prescriber |
| Pradeep Agrawal | Biomedical scientist |
| Niall Gooch | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Programme name | Non-Medical Prescribing |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 July 2006 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 35 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09132 |

| | |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|
| Programme name | Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 6) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM09134 |

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Programme name | Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 7) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM09135 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 | |
|--|-----------|---|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes | |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes | |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes | |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes | |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | No | No evidence included, no reason given (see additional evidence request below) |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | No | No evidence included, no reason given (see additional evidence request below) |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

D.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.

Reason: The visitors viewed the evidence submitted dealing with training and CPD for practice educators. This handbook detailed what the education provider's expectations and intentions around regular appropriate training for practice educators were, but it was not clear to the visitors how the education provider ensured that this actually took place as intended and required. They therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which shows how the education provider ensured that the training of practice educators was appropriate and up to date in the academic years 2017-18 and 2018-19 (the years within the scope of this audit).

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

The visitors considered that the standard was met at threshold because documentation had been provided which detailed a clear expectation that staff involved in supervising learners in practice-based learning would keep their training up to date, and required them to declare at the point of recruitment that they had appropriate professional qualifications for such supervision. They understood that the education provider would expect such individuals to use the framework provided by the education provider to identify gaps in their knowledge and expertise, if any. This was a reasonable approach.

However, the visitors did note from the documentation submitted that it did not appear that the education provider proactively sought to identify gaps in the supervisors' knowledge or experience themselves. This may create a risk in the future that the standard is no longer met because the education provider ceases to have a clear idea of the training status of the staff. The visitors suggest, therefore, that the education provider keep under review their means of identifying training needs in practice educators.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Essex |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Part time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time |
| Date submission received | 23 June 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15416-D3F7W3 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|----------------|------------------------|
| Claire Brewis | Occupational therapist |
| Janet Lawrence | Physiotherapist |
| Patrick Armsby | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2006 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09137 |

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2017 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 45 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09147 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and

experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider submitted a programme and module lead descriptor and a subject lead role descriptor. The education provider also indicated in their narrative that the subject and programme leads are appointed in consultation with the Dean and should have significant professional, practical and academic experience. From this evidence the visitors could see the duties that would be required of the person holding overall professional responsibility. However, they could not see how the education provider would determine the programme and subject leads are appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the register. As such they could not determine this standard was met. This standard requires the education provider to demonstrate how they ensure that the individual fulfilling this role is suitably qualified and experienced. The education provider must provide further information to show how they ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced. Furthermore, they must show how they ensure this person is on the relevant part of the Register or how they make suitable alternative arrangements if they are not.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how the education provider ensures that the person holding overall professional responsibility is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Essex |
| Name of programme(s) | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy), Full time |
| Date submission received | 12 June 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15585-F5S8G5 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation..... | 3 |

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Lincoln Simmonds | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Sarah Hulme | Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist |
| Rabie Sultan | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Clinical psychologist |
| First intake | 01 January 2005 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09138 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|------------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider | University of Essex |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time |
| Date submission received | 01 July 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15600-Y4Q6M2 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|----------------|------------------------|
| Claire Brewis | Occupational therapist |
| Janet Lawrence | Physiotherapist |
| Patrick Armsby | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2010 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 45 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09142 |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2010 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 45 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09143 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and

experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider submitted a programme and module lead descriptor and a subject lead role descriptor. The education provider also indicated in their narrative that the subject and programme leads are appointed in consultation with the Dean and should have significant professional, practical and academic experience. From this evidence the visitors could see the duties that would be required of the person holding overall professional responsibility. However, they could not see how the education provider would determine the programme and subject leads are appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the register. As such they could not determine this standard was met. This standard requires the education provider to demonstrate how they ensure that the individual fulfilling this role is suitably qualified and experienced. The education provider must provide further information to show how they ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced. Furthermore, they must show how they ensure this person is on the relevant part of the Register or how they make suitable alternative arrangements if they are not.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how the education provider ensures that the person holding overall professional responsibility is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Education provider | University of Essex |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time |
| Date submission received | 30 June 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15602-W6T3P3 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|----------------|------------------------|
| Claire Brewis | Occupational therapist |
| Janet Lawrence | Physiotherapist |
| Patrick Armsby | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 August 2017 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09148 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider highlighted a document titled guidance on internal and external reference points. This document indicates the different reference points that programmes have to meet from various accrediting bodies. In this document it is mentioned that certain programmes must meet HCPC SET 3.3 which requires the programme lead to be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register. The narrative in the SETs mapping document states that as it is acknowledged in the internal and external reference points document all programmes must meet it. The narrative and evidence suggested to the visitors that the education provider was stating that they had met the standard rather than showing how they meet it. This is a new standard that they must evidence as part of this annual monitoring audit. This standard is intended to ensure that the education provider (not the HCPC) ensures that the individual fulfilling this role is suitability qualified and experienced on an

ongoing basis rather than a fixed point. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to show how the education provider determines the person holding professional responsibility is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register. Furthermore, the visitors need to see evidence that there is an effective process in place to identify a suitable programme lead and if necessary, a suitable replacement.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how the education provider ensures that the person holding overall professional responsibility is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the **20 August 2020** meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Essex |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Including Placement Year), Full time BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Including Year Abroad), Full time |
| Date submission received | 28 May 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15606-Q8H8F5 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Catherine Mackenzie | Speech and language therapist |
| Caroline Sykes | Speech and language therapist |
| John Archibald | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Speech and language therapist |
| First intake | 01 October 2018 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09149 |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Including Placement Year) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Speech and language therapist |

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------|
| First intake | 01 October 2018 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09150 |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Including Year Abroad) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Speech and language therapist |
| First intake | 01 October 2018 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09151 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 | Reason(s) for non-submission |
|--|-----------|--|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes | |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes | |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | No | The programmes started in October 2018 so there is only one year on which to report. The education provider's validation processes states that the first year of a programme is not subject to external examination. As a result, no external examiner reports or responses are provided in this submission. |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | No | The programmes started in October 2018 so there is only one year on which to report. The education provider's validation processes states |

| | | |
|--|----|--|
| | | that the first year of a programme is not subject to external examination. As a result, no external examiner reports or responses are provided in this submission. |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | No | The programmes started in October 2018 so there is only one year on which to report. |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | No | The programmes started in October 2018 so there is only one year on which to report. |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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.

Reason: The visitors were made aware there had been no changes to the way the programme meets this standard. However, the visitors saw that the staff student liaison committee minutes of February 2019 indicated that some students were unprepared for costs related to placement attendance. The visitors therefore were unclear whether applicants were provided with all the information needed to come to an appropriate decision about their suitability for the programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further evidence that applicants and those in receipt of offers receive full information of costs which may be involved in the programme, in order to make an informed choice about taking up an offer of a place on the programme.

2.7 The education provider must ensure that there are equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.

Reason: The visitors were made aware there had been no changes to the way the programme meets this standard. However, the visitors saw the programme committee minutes of April 2019 showed that candidates continue to be interviewed when there

are no remaining places. The visitors considered that those who apply early appear to be at an advantage, and that later applicants, while meeting admission criteria and ahead of the published closing date, may be unsuccessful because all places have been allocated. The visitors therefore were unsure that the admissions process is open and impartial and does not discriminate against certain applicants.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide additional evidence that all applications received by the published closing date receive equal consideration.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The visitors were informed that interprofessional learning is covered in two practice-based learning modules, and one academic module. The visitors considered there is an interprofessional learning strategy and multi-professional practice. However, the visitors considered that as the academic module is for speech and language therapy learners only, this did not constitute learning with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions. Therefore, from the evidence provided the visitors were not clear what opportunities learners have to learn with and from learners in other relevant professions, other than in practice placement modules.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide further evidence of the opportunities in the programme, in addition to practice placement modules, where learners are able to learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider | Glasgow Caledonian University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Full time |
| Date submission received | 16 March 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15555-K0Z7Y6 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Jane Day | Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer |
| Angela Duxbury | Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer |
| Temilolu Odunaike | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Radiographer |
| Modality | Therapeutic radiographer |
| First intake | 01 September 2009 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09153 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 | Reason(s) for non-submission |
|--|-----------|--|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes | |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes | |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes | |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes | |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes | |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | No | Education provider does not have a formal service user and carer monitoring document and are currently looking for a patient representative for their programme board. |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: The education provider stated in their mapping document that there were no changes made in this area. However, within the documentation, they acknowledged that they have no formal mechanisms in place to monitor and evaluate service user and carer involvement in the programme. The visitors noted the comprehensive range of monitoring and evaluation systems currently in place on the programme. However, they were unclear how monitoring and evaluation specific to service users and carers' involvement is carried out. For instance the visitors could not determine if there were systems in place to regularly collect and analyse feedback from service users and carers. As such, they could not determine that this standard was met and therefore, request additional information to demonstrate how the programme meets this standard.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of strategies/processes involved to monitor and evaluate service user and carer involvement in the programme.

4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The visitors noted the detailed mapping of the module titles to the standards of proficiency and the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. They also noted the outlined assessment and clinical education assessment strategies. However, because the visitors were unable to review the module descriptors and learning outcomes, as these were not provided in the submission, they were unable to determine if the learning outcomes meet the expected standards of professional behaviour. Similarly, they were unable to determine if the assessment strategies for the whole programme meet the expected standards of professional behaviour. The education provider therefore, must provide evidence to demonstrate how the programme ensures that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations associated with being a regulated professional throughout and by the time they complete the programme.

Suggested evidence: Outline of all module descriptors for the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Glasgow Caledonian University |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time |
| Date submission received | 30 June 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15571-R1Q2X7 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation..... | 3 |

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|----------------|------------------------|
| Claire Brewis | Occupational therapist |
| Janet Lawrence | Physiotherapist |
| Patrick Armsby | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 August 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09166 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|------------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Education provider | Glasgow Caledonian University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time |
| Date submission received | 02 April 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15575-Q2Q8L0 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Paul Blakeman | Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration) |
| Andrew Hill | Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration) (Prescription only medicines – sale / supply) |
| Temilolu Odunaike | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Podiatry |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Chiropodist / podiatrist |
| Entitlement | Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply |
| First intake | 01 January 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09168 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|------------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: This standard requires that the education provider demonstrate that there is a process in place for ensuring that an appropriate person can be appointed to lead the programme. The education provider stated in their mapping document that the evidence is in the Generic School Document. However, the visitors noted that this document was not provided and as such, they were unable to determine that this standard is met. They

therefore request that the education provider submit evidence of how the programme meets this standard.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing the process used to identify and appoint suitable individuals to have overall professional responsibility for the programme. This could include the education provider's selection and recruitment policy, expression of interest process, person specification or job description.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: This standard requires that the education provider demonstrate how they involve learners in the quality and effectiveness of the programme. The education provider stated in their mapping document that the evidence is in the Definitive Programme Document. However, the visitors noted that this document was not provided and as such, they were unable to determine that this standard is met. They therefore request that the education provider submit evidence of how the programme meets this standard.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating how learners contribute to the quality and effectiveness of the programme. Their involvement could be through learners' feedback, partnership working between learners and educators or staff and learner liaison committees.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider is required to demonstrate how they help learners to recognise situations where service users may be at risk, supporting them in raising concerns and making sure action is taken in response to those concerns. In their mapping, the education provider referred the visitors to their Allied Health Professions Practice Based Learning Handbook. However, the visitors noted that this document was not provided in the submission. They therefore request that the education provider submit evidence of how the programme meets this standard.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing the process by which learners are enabled and supported to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The education provider referred the visitors to their HCPC SOPs mapping and Programme Learning Outcome mapping as evidence for this standard. However, the visitors noted that neither of these documents was provided in the submission. As such, the visitors were unable to determine that the standard is met. They therefore request that the education provider submit evidence of how the programme meets this standard.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing that the learning outcomes throughout the programme ensure that learners are able to understand and meet expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs).

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The education provider referred the visitors to their Interprofessional Education Framework, module descriptors and Interprofessional Education Framework Handbook to demonstrate how they deliver interprofessional education on the programme. The visitors noted that none of these documents was provided in the submission. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and other learners in other relevant profession. Therefore, the education provider must submit evidence that demonstrates how the programme meets this standard.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that shows interprofessional education is being delivered on the programme.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: As evidence for this standard, the visitors were referred to Assessment details in module descriptors. The visitors noted that there were no module descriptors submitted within the documentation for this audit. As such, they were unable to determine how this standard is met and therefore, request that the education provider submit evidence that shows how the assessments ensure that learners understand the expectations associated with being a regulated professional by the time they complete the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating that at all levels of the programme, assessment is used to ensure that learners understand and meet the HCPC SCPEs.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Glasgow Caledonian University |
| Name of programme(s) | Doctorate in Health Psychology, Full time Doctorate in Health Psychology, Part time |
| Date submission received | 25 June 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15582-H8P5Z5 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation..... | 3 |

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Joanne Lusher | Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist |
| Lynn Dunwoody | Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist |
| Temilolu Odunaike | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Programme name | Doctorate in Health Psychology |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Health psychologist |
| First intake | 01 September 2017 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09170 |

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Programme name | Doctorate in Health Psychology |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Health psychologist |
| First intake | 01 September 2017 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 2 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09173 |

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 |
|---|-----------|
| HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Glasgow Caledonian University |
| Name of programme(s) | Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology, Full time Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology, Part time |
| Date submission received | 26 June 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15584-Z0F1M2 |

Contents

| | |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation..... | 3 |
| Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)..... | 3 |

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 annual monitoring 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.

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 5 of this report.

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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Sandra Wolfson | Practitioner psychologist - Sport and exercise psychologist |
| Stephen Smith | Practitioner psychologist - Sport and exercise psychologist |
| Temilolu Odunaike | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Sport and exercise psychologist |
| First intake | 01 September 2017 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09171 |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Sport and exercise psychologist |
| First intake | 01 September 2017 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 2 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09172 |

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this

report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

The visitors noted that the external examiner expressed some concerns around staffing and resources in both his 2017/18 and 2018/19 reports. He highlighted the need to have adequate staffing and resources in place to support all learners as he considered that increase in learner numbers could put a strain on supervision and possibly learners' performance. The visitors were satisfied that there are adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff as well as sufficient resources to deliver the programme effectively to the current number of learners on the programmes. However, they considered that these areas be reviewed by HCPC visitors when the programmes next go through their annual monitoring audit, if the number of learners increases.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | UCL Institute of Education |
| Name of programme(s) | Doctorate in Professional Educational, Child and Adolescent Psychology (DEdPsy), Full time |
| Date submission received | 01 June 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15599-F1L9F0 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Lincoln Simmonds | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Sarah Hulme | Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist |
| Rabie Sultan | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Doctorate in Professional Educational, Child and Adolescent Psychology (DEdPsy) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Educational psychologist |
| First intake | 01 September 2011 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 11 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09188 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: The education provider stated in the mapping document it is part of the South East, East and London (SEEL) consortium. This consortium is a group of education providers that meet regularly as part of a committee to determine capacity and availability of practice-based learning. The education provider evidenced the terms of reference for this committee for this standard. From reviewing the evidence, the visitors

noted the roles and responsibilities of the committee members which included arranging practice-based learning placements for learners on years two and three of the programme. However, the visitors could not see any information regarding how capacity and availability for learners on year one of the programme was managed. The mapping document also stated “There is an annual planning process that culminates in a placement panel that is run by PEPs [Practice education providers] that matches trainees to placements”. This panel is responsible for ensuring learners’ needs for practice-based learning are addressed. However, there was no information provided regarding the annual planning process and how this panel operates or which years of the programme it arranges practice-based learning for. Whilst the visitors were clear regarding how practice-based learning placements is arranged for learners in year two and three of the programme, it was not clear whether the panel run by practice education providers arrange placements for learners in year one of the programme.. Therefore, the visitors could not determine if this standard has been met, as they could not determine how capacity and availability of practice-based learning is determined for year one learners on this programme.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for learners on year one of the programme.

Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Leeds Beckett University |
| Name of programme(s) | MA Art Psychotherapy Practice, Full time MA Art Psychotherapy Practice, Part time |
| Date submission received | 01 April 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15624-D5F8P1 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Jonathan Isserow | Arts therapist - Art therapist |
| John Crossfield | Arts therapist - Art therapist |
| Rabie Sultan | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Programme name | MA Art Psychotherapy Practice |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Arts therapist |
| Modality | Art therapy |
| First intake | 01 September 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09202 |

| | |
|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Programme name | MA Art Psychotherapy Practice |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| Profession | Arts therapist |
| Modality | Art therapy |
| First intake | 01 September 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09203 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The education provider stated in the mapping document that inter-professional learning (IPL) takes place during all years of this programme, where visiting lecturers and guest speakers of different positions offer practice-based learning case studies to learners. Additionally, it was also stated that IPL gets assessed within practice-based learning in the Arts Therapy Thresholds module whilst teaching on campus involves timetabled sessions with learners from other professions such as psychiatrists, play therapists and social workers. From reviewing the evidence, the visitors were able to see information regarding the visiting lecturers and how IPL takes place at practice-based learning. However, the visitors could not see any information regarding how learners on this programme, learn alongside learners from other mentioned professions on campus during timetabled sessions. Based on this, the visitors could not determine how learners will be able to learn with, and from other learners on this programme. Due to this, the visitors could not determine if the standard has been met.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how learners on this programme, learn with and from other learners on this programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#)

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Medway School of Pharmacy |
| Validating body | Universities of Greenwich and Kent |
| Name of programme(s) | Postgraduate Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing, Distance learning Postgraduate Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing, Distance learning |
| Date submission received | 05 May 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15634-W8C3K6 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|---------------|---|
| James Pickard | Chiropodist / podiatrist (Independent prescriber) |
| Karen Diamond | Arts therapist - Music therapist |
| Rabie Sultan | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Postgraduate Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing |
| Mode of study | DL (Distance learning) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM09229 |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Programme name | Postgraduate Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing |
| Mode of study | DL (Distance learning) |

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Entitlement | Supplementary Prescribing |
| First intake | 01 May 2006 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09230 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

A.2 The selection and entry criteria must include appropriate academic and professional entry standards.

Reason: The education provider referenced the 'Allied Health Professional Application form', as evidence for this standard. The visitors noted this was a revised application form for applicants to enrol onto the Independent and Supplementary Prescribing programme. The application form also contained a weblink that contained information regarding the entry requirements to be eligible to enrol onto this programme, which included having 'appropriate numeracy skills'. From reviewing the weblink, the visitors could not find any information confirming what is the minimum required numeracy skill required by applicants for eligibility to enrol onto the programme. On page eight of the application form under section 2, there is a requirement to confirm whether applicants have taken and passed a numeracy test screening. As there was no information provided in the weblink or application form, the visitors were not clear whether applicants will be aware of the minimum pass mark or qualification required to determine their numeracy skills. Based on this, the visitors could not determine whether clear information is provided with regards to the minimum numeracy skills qualification requirement.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate and clarify the minimum entry criteria requirements with regards to numeracy skills for applicants to possess, to be able to enrol onto this programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#)

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Plymouth |
| Name of programme(s) | Professional Doctorate in Clinical Psychology, Full time |
| Date submission received | 01 July 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15187-C0J4Z5 |

Contents

| | |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation..... | 3 |

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Lincoln Simmonds | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Sarah Hulme | Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist |
| Rabie Sultan | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Professional Doctorate in Clinical Psychology |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Clinical psychologist |
| First intake | 01 January 1995 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 14 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09258 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|------------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#)

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Robert Gordon University |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time Doctorate of Physiotherapy, Full time |
| Date submission received | 01 July 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15641-B4R4N7 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Contents | |
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation..... | 3 |

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|----------------|------------------------|
| Claire Brewis | Occupational therapist |
| Janet Lawrence | Physiotherapist |
| Patrick Armsby | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Programme name | MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 January 2001 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 49 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09299 |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 January 2011 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 49 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09301 |

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Programme name | Doctorate of Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 January 2017 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 8 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09306 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Scottish Ambulance Academy and Glasgow Caledonian University |
| Validating body | Glasgow Caledonian University |
| Name of programme(s) | DipHE Paramedic Practice, Full time |
| Date submission received | 30 June 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15785-B0Q8L6 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|-------------------|----------------|
| Matthew Catterall | Paramedic |
| John Donaghy | Paramedic |
| Patrick Armsby | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | DipHE Paramedic Practice |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Paramedic |
| First intake | 01 June 2011 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 50 |
| Intakes per year | 4 |
| Assessment reference | AM09323 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider highlighted the qualifications and experience of the current programme lead. They also provided their CV as evidence of their appropriateness for the role. The visitors were therefore able to determine the current programme leader was appropriately qualified and experienced. However, this standard is intended to ensure that the education provider (not the HCPC) ensures that the individual fulfilling this role is suitability qualified, and the visitors were not clear how the CV for the current programme lead ensures this. This standard requires the education provider to demonstrate how they ensure that the individual fulfilling this role is suitability qualified and experienced. The education provider must therefore provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified, experienced and from the relevant part of the Register, unless other

arrangements are appropriate. Furthermore, the education provider must provide evidence that there is an effective process in place to identify a suitable programme lead and if necessary, a suitable replacement. Therefore, the visitors require evidence that there is an appropriate process in place to ensure the suitability of the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme, and if required, a suitable replacement.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how the education provider ensures that the person holding overall professional responsibility is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register. The education provider may wish to submit a role profile, person specification, recruitment process or expression of interest process

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider highlighted that learners would be invited to complete an anonymous online survey at the end of the programme that would relate to their practice placement experience. This standard is about helping learners recognise situations where service users may be at risk and being able to raise concerns in relation to this. The visitors considered that allowing learners to raise concerns at the end of the programme may be too late to mitigate the risk and protect service users or learners may be unable to recall issues that arose at the start of the programme. Furthermore, it was not clear how learners could raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users in all parts of the programme rather than just practice-based learning. The education provider must provide further evidence to show how learners can raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users throughout the programme. Furthermore, they must show how learners are supported to raise concerns to make sure learners know who to report their concerns to and how these concerns will be considered and acted on.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show there is an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users throughout the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Stirling |
| Name of programme(s) | Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology, Full time Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology, Part time |
| Date submission received | 01 June 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15200-R4C6Y4 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Contents | |
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation..... | 3 |

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Joanne Lusher | Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist |
| Lynn Dunwoody | Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist |
| John Archibald | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Health psychologist |
| First intake | 01 September 2018 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 4 FTE across this programme and Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology, part time |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09335 |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Programme name | Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Health psychologist |
| First intake | 01 September 2018 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 4 FTE, ie 8 part time learners, across this programme and Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology, full time |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09336 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 | Reason(s) for non-submission |
|--|-----------|--|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes | |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | No | The programme has only been running since September 2019 so only one year of documents is available. |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | No | |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | No | |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | No | |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | No | |

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved..

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Ulster |
| Name of programme(s) | Pharmacotherapeutics in Prescribing, Part time Certificate in Medicines Management (Conversion to Independent Prescribing), Part time Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management (Independent and Supplementary Prescribing), Part time Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management (Supplementary Prescribing), Part time |
| Date submission received | 22 June 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15226-G4R0T3 |

Contents

| | |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation..... | 4 |

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 annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Claire Brewis | Occupational therapist |
| Janet Lawrence | Physiotherapist - Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing |
| Patrick Armsby | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Pharmacotherapeutics in Prescribing |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Prescription only medicines – sale / supply |
| First intake | 01 November 2009 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09355 |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Certificate in Medicines Management (Conversion to Independent Prescribing) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing, POM - Sale / Supply (CH) |
| First intake | 01 February 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09358 |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management (Independent and Supplementary Prescribing) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing, POM - Sale / Supply (CH) |
| First intake | 01 February 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09367 |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management (Supplementary Prescribing) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary Prescribing, POM - Sale / Supply (CH) |
| First intake | 01 February 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09368 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |
|--|-----|

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider | University of Ulster |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science with DPP (Pathology), Full time |
| Date submission received | 11 June 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15218-Q5L9Y3 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|----------------|----------------------|
| Robert Keeble | Biomedical scientist |
| Peter Abel | Biomedical scientist |
| Patrick Armsby | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science with DPP (Pathology) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Biomedical scientist |
| First intake | 01 September 2008 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09360 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The education provider has provided the CV for the current course director in order to show this standard has been met. The HCPC no longer makes judgments on individuals who are professionally responsible for the programme. This standard is intended to ensure that the education provider (not the HCPC) ensures that the individual fulfilling this role is suitability qualified, and the visitors were not clear how the CV for the current course director ensures this. We need to see evidence that there is an effective process in place to identify a suitable programme lead and if necessary, a suitable replacement. Therefore, the visitors require evidence that there is an appropriate process in place to ensure the suitability of the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme, and if required, a suitable replacement.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates how the education provider's process ensures the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced. Such as; Role profile, person specification, recruitment process or expression of interest process.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider | University of Ulster |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time |
| Date submission received | 10 March 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15224-C7X4G7 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Rebecca Khanna | Occupational therapist |
| Lorna Povey | Speech and language therapist |
| Niall Gooch | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Speech and language therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2001 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 27 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09364 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: The visitors were aware from the evidence submission that there was a tripartite arrangement between the practice-based learning stakeholders. This was a reasonable way for the education provider to approach meeting the standard, but the visitors considered that they did not have enough information about how exactly this tripartite relationship worked, and how it constituted an effective process. They were therefore unable to determine that the standard was met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how the tripartite relationship works to establish an effective process for ensuring availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were provided with a narrative of learner involvement and some evidence was referred to. The education provider stated that learners had opportunities to give their feedback on the programme. However, the visitors could not see in this evidence the detail of how learners were involved in the programme, in particular how feedback loops were closed, and so they were unable to determine whether the standard was met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to explain the detail of how learners are involved in the programme, in particular how their input is used as part of continuous improvement.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: The education provider submitted a brief narrative describing how learners were enabled to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. This seemed broadly appropriate, but the visitors noted that they were not provided with evidence relating to how learners would be enabled and supported to raise concerns when they were out on practice-based learning. They considered therefore that they could not determine whether the process for enabling learners to raise concerns in all settings was effective, and so the standard was not met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how learners are supported and enabled to raise concerns appropriately in practice-based learning.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Royal Holloway, University of London |
| Name of programme(s) | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy), Full time |
| Date submission received | 05 May 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15660-Z8T5D2 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation..... | 3 |

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Lincoln Simmonds | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Sarah Hulme | Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist |
| Rabie Sultan | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Clinical psychologist |
| First intake | 01 January 1997 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 28 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09371 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|------------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider | University of Westminster |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences, Part time |
| Date submission received | 13 May 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15662-M7Q9K2 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|----------------|----------------------|
| Jason Comber | Paramedic |
| David Houlston | Biomedical scientist |
| John Archibald | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Biomedical scientist |
| First intake | 01 September 2007 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09385 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: To meet this standard, the education provider highlighted the work-based tutors handbook. However, the visitors considered the workplace tutors handbook to consist of advice and guidance for the work-based tutor, and no details of the system to ensure or agreements in place to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require further information about the processes in place to make sure all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning that meets their learning needs.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide further information about the processes in place, for example the systems or agreements, to make sure all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: The visitors were informed that to meet this standard, concerns would usually be addressed by policies in the student's workplace as it was primarily an employer concern. Although the visitors were clear about the process within the workplace setting, the visitors did not receive any information how learners raise concerns in the academic setting. Therefore the visitors need to see further evidence of the process so learners can raise any concerns about situations in the academic setting where service users may be at risk, to support them in raising any concerns and making sure action is taken in response to those concerns.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to submit further evidence of the process so learners can raise any concerns about situations in the academic setting where service users may be at risk, to support them in raising any concerns and make sure action is taken in response to those concerns.

4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason From a review of the documentation to meet this standard, the education provider stated that learners are provided access to the HCPC Guidance on Conduct and Ethics for Students at induction and that learners undertake assignments linked to the code of conduct within two modules. The visitors were able to review the modules proformas, however it was not clear from these how the education provider ensures the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) are outlined across modules on the programme explicitly through the learning outcomes. The visitors require further evidence which shows the learning outcomes being clearly linked to the SCPEs across modules on the programme and at appropriate points through the programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how learners are able to understand throughout the programme the expectations of professional behaviour including the SCPEs.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The visitors were informed that there is no interprofessional learning (IPE) requirements in this programme. They were also made aware learners are encouraged in one module to consider the links between themselves and other healthcare colleagues. The visitors were unclear how learners are prepared to work with other professionals and across professions. The visitors considered that the programme needs to demonstrate how learners learn with and from other relevant professionals and learners. The visitors therefore need to see further information about:

- how learners learn with and from other relevant professionals and learners is embedded in the programme; and
- how decisions about the design and delivery of IPE ensures it is as relevant as possible for learners, and has the most benefit possible for their future professional practice and for service users and carers.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide further information about:

- how learners learn with and from other relevant professionals and learners is embedded in the programme; and
- how decisions about the design and delivery of IPE ensures it is as relevant as possible for learners, and has the most benefit possible for their future professional practice and for service users and carers.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Wolverhampton |
| Name of programme(s) | Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DcounsPsy), Part time Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DcounsPsy), Full time |
| Date submission received | 30 April 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15724-Q3B5B2 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Antony Ward | Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist |
| Vikki Powell | Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist |
| Niall Gooch | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DcounsPsy) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Counselling psychologist |
| First intake | 01 September 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 1 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09387 |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Programme name | Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DcounsPsy) |
|----------------|--|

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Counselling psychologist |
| First intake | 01 January 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 18 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09389 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and

experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The education provider submitted evidence about the current programme leader and the deputy. The visitors considered that these individuals were appropriate for their roles. However, they did not see evidence relating to the process for appointing a suitable new programme leader if it became necessary to do so, as required by this standard, which says that education providers must demonstrate that there is an appropriate process in place. They were therefore unable to determine whether this standard was met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating what process the education provider uses to ensure that, if it becomes necessary to do so, they can appoint a suitable replacement programme leader, for example a narrative describing the process and a job description or person specification.

3.14 The programme must implement and monitor equality and diversity policies in relation to learners.

Reason: The education provider submitted evidence showing which policies were in place. However, the visitors could not see evidence demonstrating how the data gathered under such policies would be used, i.e. it was not clear how exactly the policies would be implemented. They were therefore unable to be certain that the standard was met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how the policies in place relating to equality and diversity are implemented in the specific context of this programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Wolverhampton |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, Full time |
| Date submission received | 16 April 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15726-H5Z1Q5 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Rosemary Furner | Independent prescriber |
| Pradeep Agrawal | Biomedical scientist |
| Niall Gooch | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Biomedical scientist |
| First intake | 01 September 2010 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09390 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The evidence provided stated that the education provider were recruiting a new programme leader for September 2020, but it was not clear how far through this process the education provider was, or what the detail of the process was. This standard requires education providers to demonstrate how they ensure an appropriate process for appointing a programme leader. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether it was met in the absence of clear evidence concerning the nature of the process.

Suggested evidence: Evidence clarifying what process the education provider employs to ensure that a suitable person can be appointed to the programme leader role.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Education provider | University of Wolverhampton |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time |
| Date submission received | 21 May 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15729-L0H5V9 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Jo Jackson | Physiotherapist |
| Helen Catherine White | Dietitian |
| Temilolu Odunaike | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2017 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09393 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard, including the list of practice partners, the physiotherapy placement agreement 2019-2022 and the audit document. The visitors noted that page 84 of the audit document identified “large deficit in placement offers” and stated that “the issue has been escalated”. However, the visitors did not see information that shows how the issue is being or has been addressed. Also, in the list of practice partners, the visitors saw that there was only a maximum of 23 placement offers at any given time even though there are a total of 30 learners on the programme. The visitors also noted that the quarterly placement capacity meeting focused largely on other professions, particularly nursing, with no particular focus on how the education provider will ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning for the physiotherapy learners. As the visitors did not see evidence that demonstrates that all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs, they could not determine that this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Updated information on practice-based learning capacity that demonstrates there is effective system for ensuring availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners on the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of York |
| Name of programme(s) | Supplementary Prescriber (Level 7), Part time Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Nurses, Midwives and AHPs Level 6, Part time Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Nurses, Midwives and AHPs Level 7, Part time Supplementary Prescriber (Level 6), Part time |
| Date submission received | 12 June 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15723-V8J2S0 |

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Claire Brewis | Occupational therapist |
| Janet Lawrence | Physiotherapist (Independent prescriber) Physiotherapist (Supplementary prescriber) |
| Patrick Armsby | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Programme name | Supplementary Prescriber (Level 7) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 October 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09400 |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Nurses, Midwives and AHPs Level 6 |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 October 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09401 |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Nurses, Midwives and AHPs Level 7 |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 October 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09402 |

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Programme name | Supplementary Prescriber (Level 6) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 October 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM09403 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

D.6 Practice educators must be a qualified prescriber, on the register of their statutory regulator with annotation(s) for prescribing where applicable and with the relevant skills, knowledge and experience to support safe and effective learning.

Reason: This standard has been changed and education providers are required to make a declaration that the appropriate changes from designated medical practitioners (DMP) included in the previous iteration of the standard have been made. The mapping document requests a narrative if they cannot complete the declaration section. In this they have indicated that they have not updated their audit documentation to reflect the changes to practice educators. The visitors also noted in a review of course documentation that the education provider was using the term DMP in relation to practice-based learning. The education provider must show that they are applying the new standard to the programme and why they have not updated the practice-based learning audit documentation to ensure revised requirements are audited.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show the revised standard is being applied to the programme and in practice-based learning.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 August 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).