

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details .....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Bournemouth University
<b>Programme title</b>	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals (Non Medical Prescribing)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>	Supplementary Prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Bob Dobson (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Podiatrist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	22 March 2011

### Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

### Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

#### 3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

**Reason:** On reading the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document, the visitors were directed to the Bournemouth University handbook for information about the student complaints process. The visitors could not locate the Bournemouth University handbook nor could they locate information about the student complaints process elsewhere within the documentation and therefore the visitors could not be sure that this standard was met.

**Suggested documentation:** Information outlining the student complaints process.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-27	d	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Bournemouth - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitor report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details .....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Canterbury Christ Church University
<b>Programme title</b>	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Susan Boardman (Paramedic) Second visitor unavailable due to unforeseen circumstances
<b>HPC executive</b>	Brendon Edmonds
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	24 May 2011

### Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - No reports included specific to AHP's as no students have commenced on the programme since 2007.
  - Validation report
  - Student fitness to practice policy

- Student complaints procedure

### Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

The visitor agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-27	a	EDU	RPT	AM report - CCCU - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details .....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Canterbury Christ Church University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational therapist) Tracy Clephan (Dietitian)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	24 May 2011

### Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Rupert Kerrell CV
  - University Complaints Procedure
  - Professional Lead Presentation
  - Faculty of Health and Social Care Practice Learning Handbook

- Fundamentals of Professional Collaboration Module Handbook
- Student Fitness to Practice Policy

### Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-25	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - CCCU - BSc (Hons) OT- FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitor report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details .....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	London Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Susan Boardman (Paramedic) Second visitor unavailable due to unforeseen circumstances
<b>HPC executive</b>	Brendon Edmonds
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	24 May 2011

### Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - No response to external examiner reports submitted as there were no issues raised which required a response (see education providers email to Education Department, 17 May 2011)
  - Learning agreement

- Complaints procedure

### Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

The visitor agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-27	a	EDU	RPT	AM report - London Met - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None



## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details .....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Oxford Brookes University
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-medical Prescribing (v300) (Level 6)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Paul Blakeman (Podiatrist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Ben Potter
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	24 March 2011

### Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Student Support. Extract from 10,11 OBU Student Handbooks
  - Appeals, Complaints & Conduct webpage
  - Quality and Standards Handbook

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

#### **3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.**

**Reason:** In the documentation provided for the annual monitoring audit the visitors could not determine what process is in place for dealing with concerns about students profession related conduct. Therefore the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine if the programme meets this standard.

**Suggested documentation:** Information regarding the process used throughout the programme to deal with students' profession related conduct.

#### **4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.**

**Reason:** In the documentation provided for the annual monitoring audit the visitors identified that students are required to meet several learning outcomes regarding issues around professional conduct. However from the information provided the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensures that students on the programme are aware of the implications of HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Therefore the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine if the programme meets this standard.

**Suggested documentation:** Information regarding how the programme team ensures that students are aware of the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Information regarding this may be contained within the programme handbook.

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
  
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details .....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Oxford Brookes University
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-medical Prescribing (v300) (PG Level)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Paul Blakeman (Podiatrist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Ben Potter
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	24 March 2011

### Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Student Support. Extract from 10,11 OBU Student Handbooks
  - Appeals, Complaints & Conduct webpage
  - Quality and Standards Handbook

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

#### **3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.**

**Reason:** In the documentation provided for the annual monitoring audit the visitors could not determine what process is in place for dealing with concerns about students profession related conduct. Therefore the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine if the programme meets this standard.

**Suggested documentation:** Information regarding the process used throughout the programme to deal with students' profession related conduct.

#### **4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.**

**Reason:** In the documentation provided for the annual monitoring audit the visitors identified that students are required to meet several learning outcomes regarding issues around professional conduct. However from the information provided the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensures that students on the programme are aware of the implications of HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Therefore the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine if the programme meets this standard.

**Suggested documentation:** Information regarding how the programme team ensures that students are aware of the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Information regarding this may be contained within the programme handbook.

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
  
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details .....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Staffordshire University
<b>Programme title</b>	Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Bob Fellows (Paramedic) Paul Brown (Therapeutic radiographer)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Paula Lescott
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	24 May 2011

### Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- The education provider has not submitted the standard documents listed above as the programme only started running in September 2010.
- Documentation submitted as evidence to support SET 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.13, 3.16, 4.5 and 6.4

### Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-27	a	EDU	RPT	AM report - Staffordshire - Fd PA - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None



## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details .....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Staffordshire University
<b>Programme title</b>	Foundation Degree in Professional Development in Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Bob Fellows (Paramedic) Paul Brown (Therapeutic radiographer)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Paula Lescott
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	24 May 2011

### Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Documentation submitted as evidence to support SET 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.13, 3.16, 4.5 and 6.4

### Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-27	a	EDU	RPT	AM report - Staffordshire - Fd PD PA - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitor report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details .....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University Campus Suffolk
<b>Name of awarding / validating body</b>	Universities of East Anglia and Essex
<b>Programme title</b>	Non Medical Prescribing
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Susan Boardman (Paramedic) Second visitor unavailable due to unforeseen circumstances
<b>HPC executive</b>	Brendon Edmonds
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	24 May 2011

### Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Full definitive programme document
  - Module handbook
  - Practice portfolio

- Appointment of external examiner guide
- Preparation and conduct of examinations
- Complaints procedure
- Academic appeals
- Assessment moderation policy
- Assessment board
- Professional misconduct and unsuitability procedure

### Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

The visitor agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-27	a	EDU	RPT	AM report - University Campus Suffolk - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details .....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3
Section five: Visitors' comments .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bedfordshire
<b>Programme title</b>	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	22 March 2011

### Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Course handbook including course information form and unit information form
  - Major change summary document

- Course monitoring document and CVs

### Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

#### 4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

**Reason:** From a review of the audit documentation the visitors were unable to find clear evidence that the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Within the audit documentation the visitors noted some reference to professional standards and the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics on p7 of the ODP course handbook. Within the standards of education and training mapping document the visitors were directed to unit descriptors for the 'professional issues' unit and 'management of care and specialist practice in the operating department' unit. However the visitors could not see where and how the unit descriptors clearly highlighted the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and how they make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards. The visitors require the education provider to provide clear evidence that shows how the curriculum makes sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and outlines how these standards are taught within the programme.

**Suggested documentation:** Specify where in the programme the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are taught and built into the curriculum and how the education provider ensures that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-27	c	EDU	RPT	AM Report - Bedfordshire - DipHE ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

#### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

#### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors would like the education provider to consider the way in which it references and signposts the visitors to the documentation in annual monitoring audits. The visitors noted the difficulty of finding the required information within the audit submission. The visitors recommend the education provider reviews this referencing for future annual monitoring submissions.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-27	c	EDU	RPT	AM Report - Bedfordshire - DipHE ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details .....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Brighton
<b>Programme title</b>	Clinical Pharmacology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>	Prescription Only Medicine
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Bob Dobson (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Podiatrist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	22 March 2010

### Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- The Clinical Pharmacology programme is running 4 months later than in previous years therefore it has not featured in the most recent external examiners report.



### Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

#### 3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

**Reason:** The standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document from the education provider says that 'Information on academic appeals are covered in considerable detail in University documentation'. The evidence provided pointed the visitors towards an academic appeals process on pages 82-98 of the General Examination and Assessment for Taught courses document. The visitors felt that the appeals policy did not constitute a student complaints policy because it did not provide a process to deal with students' concerns about the programme or a related service, or allegations of harassment or discrimination. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether this standard was met.

**Suggested documentation:** Clarification of the process for dealing with students' complaints.

#### 4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

**Reason:** In the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document the visitors were informed that 'lectures in this module cover the issues around standards of conduct, performance and ethics' and they were directed to the module handbook timetable in the HEM 31 Pharmacology handbook. The Clinical Pharmacology programme audit information received related to the MSc Clinical Pharmacology programme. It was not clear as to how the curriculum for the MSc programme ensures that students taking the stand alone unit understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct performance and ethics. In addition the timetable indicated that the students were being taught "Prescribing, the law, ethics and professional practice in podiatry". From the visitors reading of the timetable it was not clear whether the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were being taught in this lecture session. Therefore the visitors were unclear as to how this standard is met.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-27	f	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Brighton - POM - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

**Suggested documentation:** Documentation which clearly identifies how students are taught about the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

#### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
  
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-27	f	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Brighton - POM - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitor report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details .....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Chester
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Prescribing
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Susan Boardman (Paramedic) Second visitor unavailable due to unforeseen circumstances
<b>HPC executive</b>	Brendon Edmonds
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	24 May 2011

### Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Student complaints procedure
  - Academic appeals procedure
  - Professional suitability procedure
  - Module descriptor

### Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

The visitor agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-27	a	EDU	RPT	AM report - Chester - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details .....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Nottingham
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical prescribing (Level 3)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>	Supplementary Prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Bob Dobson (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Podiatrist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	22 March 2011

### Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

The external examiner did not complete a report from two years ago but it was confirmed that feedback had been provided by the external examiner.

### Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

#### 3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

**Reason:** In the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document, the visitors were referred to the student handbook, page 25, section 5.3 as evidence of the student complaints process. The visitors were unable to locate this document and could not find information about the student complaints process within the rest of the submission. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether this standard was met.

**Suggested documentation:** Documentation relating to the student complaints process.

#### 3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

**Reason:** In the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document the visitors were informed that there was a process in place for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct and were directed to page 11 of the Course Handbook. In the handbook, the visitors noted that 'The marker or examiner will award a fail mark to any student demonstrating practice considered to be unsafe regardless of the score achieved in any of the assessments detailed below.' The visitors also located a section entitled Promoting Safe Practice which outlined what would happen if unsafe practice was identified within an assessment. However the visitors could not locate details of what the education provider considered to be unsafe practice or how this was communicated to students. Therefore they could not determine whether the standard was fully met.

**Suggested documentation:** Further documentation showing the process for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct which outlines what unsafe practice is and how it is communicated to students.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-27	e	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Nottingham - SP Level 3 - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

#### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
  
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-27	e	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Nottingham - SP Level 3 - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details .....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Nottingham
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical prescribing (M Level)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>	Supplementary Prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Bob Dobson (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Podiatrist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	22 March 2011

### Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

The external examiner did not complete a report from two years ago but it was confirmed that feedback had been provided by the external examiner.



### Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

#### 3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

**Reason:** In the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document, the visitors were referred to the student handbook, page 25, section 5.3 as evidence of the student complaints process. The visitors were unable to locate this document and could not find information about the student complaints process within the rest of the submission. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether this standard was met.

**Suggested documentation:** Documentation relating to the student complaints process.

#### 3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

**Reason:** In the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document the visitors were informed that there was a process in place for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct and were directed to page 11 of the Course Handbook. In the handbook, the visitors noted that 'The marker or examiner will award a fail mark to any student demonstrating practice considered to be unsafe regardless of the score achieved in any of the assessments detailed below.' The visitors also located a section entitled Promoting Safe Practice which outlined what would happen if unsafe practice was identified within an assessment. However the visitors could not locate details of what the education provider considered to be unsafe practice or how this was communicated to students. Therefore they could not determine whether the standard was fully met.

**Suggested documentation:** Further documentation showing the process for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct which outlines what unsafe practice is and how it is communicated to students.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-27	e	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Nottingham - SP Level M - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

#### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-27	e	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Nottingham - SP Level M - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details .....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Portsmouth
<b>Programme title</b>	FdSc Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Bob Fellows (Paramedic) Paul Brown (Therapeutic radiographer)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Paula Lescott
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	24 May 2011

### Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Science Faculty placement handbook
  - Student complaint policy
  - Handbook of student regulations

- Unit descriptors – Developing Professional Practice and Professional Practice

### Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
<a href="#">2011-05-27</a>	a	EDU	RPT	<a href="#">AM report - Portsmouth - FdSc PA - FT &amp; PTAM report - Portsmouth - FdSc PA - FT &amp; PTAM report</a>	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitor report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details .....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Salford
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 6) Formerly Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 3)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Flexible
<b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Susan Boardman (Paramedic) Second visitor unavailable due to unforeseen circumstances
<b>HPC executive</b>	Brendon Edmonds
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	24 May 2011

### Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Programme handbook (Level 6 & 7) for two years
  - HPC Guidance for student conduct and ethics
  - Fitness for practice procedure

### Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

The visitor agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-27	a	EDU	RPT	AM report - Salford - SP (Level 6) - Flex	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitor report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details .....	1
Section two: Submission details .....	1
Section three: Additional documentation .....	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Salford
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 7) Formerly Non-Medical Prescribing (M level)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Flexible
<b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Susan Boardman (Paramedic) Second visitor unavailable due to unforeseen circumstances
<b>HPC executive</b>	Brendon Edmonds
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	24 May 2011

### Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Programme handbook (Level 6 & 7) for two years
  - HPC Guidance for student conduct and ethics
  - Fitness for practice procedure

### Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

The visitor agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-27	a	EDU	RPT	AM report - Salford - SP (Level 7) - Flex	Final DD: None	Public RD: None