

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

Name of education provider	Bournemouth University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Clare Brewis (Occupational therapist) Janek Dubowski (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	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
 - Appendix 1 - Programme quality assurance
 - Appendix 2 - Staff CV
 - Appendix 3 - Student complaints procedure
 - Appendix 4 - Fitness to practice policy
 - Appendix 5 - Foundation knowledge and practice portfolio 1 level C

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	Bournemouth University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	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
- Appendix 1 (a, b and c) :2009/2010/2011 Admissions BSc Physiotherapy - admissions criteria
 - Appendix 2 (a, b, and c) :2009/2010/2011 Short listing criteria
 - Appendix 3: B16 Obtaining student feedback: unit level
 - Appendix 4: Quality assurance

- Appendix 5: Judith Chapman CV
- Appendix 6: Susanna Bentman CV
- Appendix 7: Bournemouth University student complaints policy and procedure
- Appendix 8: Fitness to practice procedure December 2009 version 1.3
- Appendix 9: Academic advisor policy
- Appendix 10: Foundations of therapy unit specification
- Appendix 11, 12, 13: Portfolio 1-3 unit specifications
- Appendix 14: Portfolio marking guidelines

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	Bournemouth University
Programme title	FdSc Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Paul Blakeman (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	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
 - IQD Student Complaints Procedure
 - IQD Fitness to Practice Procedure
 - IQD Programme Team Meeting Minutes – 2008, 2009 and 2010

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Bournemouth University
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	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
 - Appendix 1 – Admissions Information
 - Appendix 2 – Staff CV
 - Appendix 3 – Student Complaints Procedure
 - Appendix 4 – Clinical Skills Information and Consent form

- Appendix 5 – Fitness to Practice Policy
- Appendix 6 - Programme Quality Assurance
- Appendix 7 - Foundation Knowledge and Practice Portfolio 1 Level C

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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted clear evidence within the audit documentation that demonstrates that the education provider ensures that the curriculum makes sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. The visitors did note however that the education provider makes frequent reference to the requirements of professional bodies in terms of conduct and ethics. The visitors suggest that the education provider may want to consider

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

linking in the role and requirements of the regulatory body into the module descriptors more explicitly to enhance clarity.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	Brunel University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Margaret Foster (Occupational therapist) Jane Grant (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of postal review	20 April 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
 - Document A: Timeline of Quality Monitoring Process
 - Document B: Complaints Procedure
 - Document C: Staff Profiles

- Document D: BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy Student Programme Handbook September 2009
- Document E: CV for Elizabeth McKay

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.
2011-04-27	c	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Brunel - BSc (Hons) OT - FT&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

Name of education provider	Brunel University
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Margaret Foster (Occupational therapist) Jane Grant (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of postal review	20 April 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
 - Document A: Timeline of Quality Monitoring Process
 - Document B: Complaints Procedure
 - Document C: Staff Profiles
 - Document E: CV for Elizabeth McKay

- Document F: MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) Student Programme Handbook Sept 2009
- Document G: Approval for Credit Conversion
- Document H: Major Change Document and email response

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.
2011-04-27	c	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Brunel - MSc OT - 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

Name of education provider	Centre for Psychotherapy (Belfast Health & Social Care Trust)
Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)	University of East London
Programme title	MSc Art Psychotherapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Art therapist
Relevant modality	Art therapy
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Clare Brewis (Occupational therapist) Janek Dubowski (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	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
 - MSc AP information leaflet

- New clinical supervisors' CVs
- Module 5/6 booklet/dissertation handbook
- Clinical handbook
- Placement information pack

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.

6.2 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and the standards of education and training mapping document the visitors have noted changes to the length of the dissertation on the programme. The visitors were unable to determine the scope of change and whether the word count had increased or decreased. The visitors require further information outlining details of the change to ensure that the assessment methods continue to provide a rigorous and effective process by which external-reference frameworks can be measured and students on the programme continue to meet the standard of proficiency 2b.1, where applicants need to 'be able to use research'.

Suggested documentation: The visitors require a clear rationale for the change to the dissertation length and module outline for the dissertation before and after the changes.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Sue Strand (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	1 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
 - Programme specification
 - Programme team CV's
 - Appendix 11 – Complaints
 - Module evaluation form

- Professional suitability Policy and Procedure

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.

6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: The visitors noted in the SETs mapping document provided by the programme team that there was a change in the 'faculty wide marking criteria for undergraduate modules' implemented in September 2010. However the visitors could not determine from the documentation if these changes have affected the assessment methodology of the programme. Therefore the visitors require evidence to determine if the changes to the undergraduate marking criteria have affected the methods employed by the programme team to determine if students are meeting the relevant learning outcomes.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding any changes made to the programme assessment methodology and strategy as a result of the change to the undergraduate marking criteria.

6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Reason: The visitors noted in the SETs mapping document provided by the programme team that there was a change in the 'faculty wide marking criteria for undergraduate modules' implemented in September 2010. However the visitors could not determine from the documentation if these changes have affected how the programme team ensures that the measurement of student performance is objective. Therefore the visitors require evidence to determine if the changes to the undergraduate marking criteria have affected the way in which the programme team ensure objectivity in measuring student performance.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding any changes made to the programme assessment methodology and strategy as a result of the change to the undergraduate marking criteria.

6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Reason: The visitors noted in the SETs mapping document provided by the programme team that there was a change in the 'faculty wide marking criteria for undergraduate modules' implemented in September 2010. However the visitors could not determine from the documentation if these changes have affected how the programme team ensures that there are appropriate standards in the assessment of student performance. Therefore the visitors require evidence to determine if the changes to the undergraduate marking criteria have affected the way in which the programme team ensure the appropriate standards in assessment are maintained.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding any changes made to the programme assessment methodology and strategy as a result of the change to the undergraduate marking criteria.

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

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 3)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Bob Fellows (Paramedic) Brian Ellis (Chiropodist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	1 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
 - New faculty marking criteria
 - New external examiner application and CV
 - Student complaints system
 - Programme evaluation form

- Professional suitability policy
- HPC ethics, code of conduct – learning outcomes list where covered.

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: Documentation provided for this audit submission did not fully address this standard. The SETs mapping document stated that evidence could be found in the “learning outcomes of module” (SETs Mapping, SET 4.5). However, the visitors could not see where in the documentation evidence for this standard was being met, and where in the taught content of the programme, the HPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the implications of the standards were being included. The visitors require further details regarding where in the programme the students are being informed of the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Detail to show where the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are being incorporated into the curriculum.

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-03-02	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Coventry - Cert SP - Level 3 - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2011-03-02	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Coventry - Cert 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	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing (M Level)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Bob Fellows (Paramedic) Brian Ellis (Chiropodist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	1 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
 - New faculty marking criteria
 - New external examiner application and CV
 - Student complaints system
 - Programme evaluation form

- Professional suitability policy
- HPC ethics, code of conduct – learning outcomes list where covered.

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: Documentation provided for this audit submission did not fully address this standard. The SETs mapping document stated that evidence could be found in the “learning outcomes of module” (SETs Mapping, SET 4.5). However, the visitors could not see where in the documentation evidence for this standard was being met, and where in the taught content of the programme, the HPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the implications of the standards were being included. The visitors require further details regarding where in the programme the students are being informed of the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Detail to show where the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are being incorporated into the curriculum.

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-03-02	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Coventry - Cert SP - Level 3 - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2011-03-02	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Coventry - Cert 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	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Katie Bosworth (Physiotherapist) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	1 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
 - Programme specification
 - CV's for staff
 - Complaints procedure
 - Professional suitability policy and procedures

- Student module evaluation form

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.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors noted the change of external examiner to “Janet xxx” (outlined against standard of education and training (SET) 6.11 in the SETs mapping document) and were directed to her CV. The visitors could not locate this document within the submission. In addition, the visitors noted that a response to the external examiner submission (dated November 2010) indicated a third person as the external examiner for the programme. The visitors were therefore unsure of who the external examiner was for the programme and whether they were appropriately experienced and qualified, and unless other arrangements are agreed, were from the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of who the external examiner is and if the individual is not from the relevant part of the Register, documentation to allow the visitors to assess whether the external examiner is appropriately experienced and qualified.

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time Part time (In Service)
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Clare Brewis (Occupational therapist) Janek Dubowski (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	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

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 visitors have noted that in the standards of education and training mapping document the education provider stated the students complaints procedure was in place at the time of the HPC approval visit. The visitors noted that the approval event took place in April 2008 and that the new HPC standards of education and training were not introduced until September 2009. The visitors also note that the education provider has provided internet links as evidence of meeting the standard. The visitors are only able to review hard copies of any documentation to evidence the standard. From a review of the documentation the visitors could not find any evidence of a student's complaints process. The visitors therefore require evidence of a student complaints process.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of a 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: The visitors have noted that in the standards of education and training mapping document the education provider stated that the procedure was in place at the time of the HPC approval visit. The visitors noted that the approval event took place in April 2008 and that the new HPC standards of education and training were not introduced until September 2009. The visitors also note that the education provider has provided internet links as evidence of meeting the standard. The visitors are only able to review hard copies of any documentation to evidence the standard. From a review of the documentation the visitors could not find any evidence of a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. The visitors therefore require evidence of a student complaints process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of a process for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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

Reason: The visitors have noted that in the standards of education and training mapping document the education provider stated that the procedure was in place at the time of the HPC approval visit. The visitors note that the approval event took place in April 2008 and that the new HPC standards of education and training were not introduced until September 2009. The visitors also note that the education provider has provided internet links as evidence of meeting the standard. The visitors are only able to review hard copies of any documentation to evidence the standard. From a review of the documentation the visitors could not find any evidence that outlines where and how the education provider makes sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Details outlining how the education provider makes sure that students understand the implications of the 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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Sue Strand (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	1 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
 - Programme specification
 - Programme team CV's
 - Appendix 11 – Complaints
 - Module evaluation form

- Professional suitability Policy and Procedure

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.

6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: The visitors noted in the SETs mapping document provided by the programme team that there was a change in the 'faculty wide marking criteria for undergraduate modules' implemented in September 2010. However the visitors could not determine from the documentation if these changes have affected the assessment methodology of the programme. Therefore the visitors require evidence to determine if the changes to the undergraduate marking criteria have affected the methods employed by the programme team to determine if students are meeting the relevant learning outcomes.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding any changes made to the programme assessment methodology and strategy as a result of the change to the undergraduate marking criteria.

6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Reason: The visitors noted in the SETs mapping document provided by the programme team that there was a change in the 'faculty wide marking criteria for undergraduate modules' implemented in September 2010. However the visitors could not determine from the documentation if these changes have affected how the programme team ensures that the measurement of student performance is objective. Therefore the visitors require evidence to determine if the changes to the undergraduate marking criteria have affected the way in which the programme team ensure objectivity in measuring student performance.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding any changes made to the programme assessment methodology and strategy as a result of the change to the undergraduate marking criteria.

6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Reason: The visitors noted in the SETs mapping document provided by the programme team that there was a change in the 'faculty wide marking criteria for undergraduate modules' implemented in September 2010. However the visitors could not determine from the documentation if these changes have affected how the programme team ensures that there are appropriate standards in the assessment of student performance. Therefore the visitors require evidence to determine if the changes to the undergraduate marking criteria have affected the way in which the programme team ensure the appropriate standards in assessment are maintained.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding any changes made to the programme assessment methodology and strategy as a result of the change to the undergraduate marking criteria.

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

Name of education provider	De Montfort University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Human Communication – Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	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

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.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	De Montfort University
Programme title	Prescribing for Health Care Professionals (Level 3)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Podiatrist) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	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
 - DMU Students' Complaint Procedure
 - Faculty of Health and Life Sciences Fitness to Practice Procedure
 - NMAH 3402 and MPHE 5106 Module Guides

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: The visitors noted in the SETs mapping that the programme team state that the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) are embedded throughout the programme. They also noted in the module documents that there were brief references (p114 and 147) to the HPC SCPEs and that the HPC publication Standards of conduct, performance and ethics was included in some of the reading lists (p146). However, the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensures that students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. They also highlighted that the reference to the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics publication is out of date as the current publication was published in 2008. Therefore the visitors require more evidence to determine how the programme team ensure that students on the programme are aware of the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Further information as to how the programme team ensure that students are made aware of the implications of the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. This could be in the form of learning outcomes or material provided to students to ensure that they aware of these implications.

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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 noted on p90 of the document provided for the annual monitoring audit that 'There are no Standards or proficiencies developed separately by the HPC so the NMC Standards are used for your competencies...' The visitors would like to state that there is a specific HPC standard of proficiency (SOP) which states that Registrants must 'Know and be able to apply the key concepts which are relevant to safe and effective practice as a supplementary prescriber.' As such the statement in the document is not accurate. The visitors would also like the programme team to note that while there are no more HPC SOPs which refer specifically to the role of supplementary prescriber, many of the generic SOPs may be useful in formulating content for the programme. This would enable the HPC Registrants undertaking the programme to enhance or develop areas of proficiency they already meet in respect of the particular skills expected of a supplementary prescriber.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	De Montfort University
Programme title	Prescribing for Health Care Professionals (M Level)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Podiatrist) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	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
 - DMU Students' Complaint Procedure
 - Faculty of Health and Life Sciences Fitness to Practice Procedure
 - NMAH 3402 and MPHE 5106 Module Guides

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: The visitors noted in the SETs mapping that the programme team state that the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) are embedded throughout the programme. They also noted in the module documents that there were brief references (p114 and 147) to the HPC SCPEs and that the HPC publication Standards of conduct, performance and ethics was included in some of the reading lists (p146). However, the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensures that students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. They also highlighted that the reference to the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics publication is out of date as the current publication was published in 2008. Therefore the visitors require more evidence to determine how the programme team ensure that students on the programme are aware of the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Further information as to how the programme team ensure that students are made aware of the implications of the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. This could be in the form of learning outcomes or material provided to students to ensure that they aware of these implications.

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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 noted on p90 of the document provided for the annual monitoring audit that 'There are no Standards or proficiencies developed separately by the HPC so the NMC Standards are used for your competencies...' The visitors would like to state that there is a specific HPC standard of proficiency (SOP) which states that Registrants must 'Know and be able to apply the key concepts which are relevant to safe and effective practice as a supplementary prescriber.' As such the statement in the document is not accurate. The visitors would also like the programme team to note that while there are no more HPC SOPs which refer specifically to the role of supplementary prescriber, many of the generic SOPs may be useful in formulating content for the programme. This would enable the HPC Registrants undertaking the programme to enhance or develop areas of proficiency they already meet in respect of the particular skills expected of a supplementary prescriber.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	De Montfort University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist) A second visitor was allocated to this submission but was unable to attend at short notice.
HPC executive	Brendon Edmonds
Date of assessment day	1 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
 - Self-evaluation document
 - Undergraduate handbook and course guide
 - Module summaries document and module handbooks

- Undergraduate module templates
- Appendix documentation for periodic review
- Staff profiles
- Handbook and regulations for undergraduate awards
- General regulations and procedures affecting students
- Minutes of programme management board
- Response to student feedback

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.

2.1 The admissions procedures 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: References in the Undergraduate Guide and Handbook, pg. 7 and in the Co-Terminus training module, pg. 2 informs students of the process of HPC registration after completion of certain aspects of the programme. In particular the visitor noted students are advised they 'must be registered with the Health Professions Council (HPC) following completion of a portfolio of competence'. Also students were advised 'that Health Professions Council registration as a Biomedical Scientist comes at the same time as your degree graduation (co-terminus - both aspects end at the same time)'. The visitor was not satisfied these references to the requirements for HPC registration provided a student or potential applicant with the information needed to make informed choices when applying or progressing on the programme.

To apply to the HPC register to practice as a biomedical scientist, students must have been awarded the degree which has been approved by the HPC, namely the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, full time programme from De Montfort University. Also after successful completion of this programme students are 'eligible to apply' for registration with the HPC and all applicants are then subject to further checks.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Suggested documentation: To be satisfied this standard continues to be met, the visitor requires the documents references stated above be amended to inform students and potential applicants that they are 'eligible to apply for HPC registration upon successful completion of the programme'.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: The visitor noted various references across the programme documentation made to different complaints which could be made by a student on the programme. The visitor did not receive evidence of a document specifically detailing the complaints process in full. The visitor was not satisfied there was evidence of a formal student complaints process in place and was unclear how such a process was communicated to a student.

Suggested documentation: To be satisfied this standard is met, the visitor recommends the education provider review the programme documentation and resubmit a consolidated student complaints process. This should clearly articulate for a student how student concerns' about a programme or related service, and allegations of harassment or discrimination are dealt with by the education provider.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	Liverpool John Moores University
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Bob Fellows (Paramedic) Brian Ellis (Chiropodist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	1 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 handbook
 - Module proformas
 - Supervisors handbook
 - 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.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: Documentation provided for the audit submission included a SETs mapping document. The evidence referenced for this SET stated that information could be found in the Student Handbook. The Student Handbook had a reference to the student complaints process that stated “If you have a problem or complaint that we are unable to resolve, you may get help from LJMU student services, or you may wish to contact the Faculty Director” (The Faculty Structure – Where to go for help). The visitors considered this to not provide enough information about the student complaints process and therefore require further information about the student complaints process to ensure there is one in place for this programme.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding 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.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-03-02	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report - LJMU - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2011-03-02	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report - LJM U - 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

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist) Fiona McCullough (Dietician)
HPC executive	Brendon Edmonds
Date of assessment day	1 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
 - NHS Bursary undergraduate Placement 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.

2.1 The admissions procedures 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 noted the NHS Bursary Undergraduate Placement Handbook, pg. 3 stated 'you will be completing a co-terminus degree ie. you graduate and achieve HPC registration together, allowing you to apply immediately for career posts (BMS 1 posts)'. However, the completion of an approved HPC programme only provides eligibility to apply to the Register with any applicant being subject to further checks. The visitors concluded this could be potentially misleading to potential applicants and for students on the programme.

Suggested documentation: The visitors require the statement above be amended to advise students and potential applicants that successful completion of the programme provides eligibility to apply to the Register.

5.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: The visitors noted the NHS Bursary undergraduate Placement Handbook, pg. 9, stated, in regards to education provider's position on the removal of placement sites that, 'This is out with any recognition that the Health Professions Council may have bestowed upon the laboratory'. The HPC does not separately approve any specific sites of placement provision. As part of approving a programme, the HPC must be satisfied the education provider has complete responsibility for the entire delivery of a programme, including any placement provision.

Suggested documentation: The visitors require the reference to HPC approval of placements on pg. 9 of the NHS Bursary undergraduate Placement Handbook be removed.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Psychology and Speech Pathology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	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
- Minutes from Faculty Academic Development Committee (FADC) 22 April 2010

- Minutes from Faculty Academic Development Committee (FADC) 3 June 2010
- CVs: Jennifer Read, John Lancaster
- Student Regulations and Procedures, Student Complaints Procedure - Clinical Placement handbook
- Professional Unsuitability Procedure
- Programme definitive document

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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors would like to recommend that the programme team reviews and where necessary updates the reading lists for the module descriptors. The visitors were happy with the content of the module descriptors but noted that

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

there were references to out of date books. In order for students to be as up to date as possible the book lists could be reviewed for currency.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2
Section five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech Pathology and Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	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
- Minutes from Faculty Academic Development Committee (FADC) 22 April 2010 and Minutes from Faculty Academic Development Committee (FADC) 3 June 2010

- CVs: Jennifer Read, John Lancaster
- Student Regulations and Procedures, Student Complaints Procedure
- Clinical Placement handbook
- Professional Unsuitability Procedure
- Programme definitive document

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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors would like to recommend that the programme team reviews and where necessary updates to the reading lists for the module descriptors. The visitors were happy with the content of the module descriptors but noted that there were references to out of date books. In order for students to be as up to date as possible the book lists could be reviewed for currency.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	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
 - External Examiner's report 2007-2008
 - Audit Form Appendix 1 – SET 3.3, SET 3.13, SET 3.16 and SET 4.5

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 evidence provided for this SET in the SETs mapping document Appendix 1 was a link to the website where the education provider's students' complaints procedure is located. Unfortunately due to the nature of the assessment of this annual monitoring submission it is not always possible to access links to websites. Because the visitors were unable to have the students' complaints procedure to view, they require the evidence in hardcopy form for them to be assured there is a student complaints process in place.

Suggested documentation: Hardcopy document of the education provider's students' complaints procedure.

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

Reason: The evidence provided for this SET in the SETs mapping document Appendix 1 was a link to the website where the education provider's rules for student conduct was located. Unfortunately due to the nature of the assessment of this annual monitoring submission it is not always possible to access links to websites. Because the visitors were unable to have the rules for student conduct to view, they require the evidence in hardcopy form for them to be assured there is a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Suggested documentation: Hardcopy document of the education provider's rules for student conduct.

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.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	New College Durham
Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme title	Certificate in Local Analgesia
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Local anaesthesia
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Bob Fellows (Paramedic) Brian Ellis (Chiropodist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	1 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 programme has not recruited any students so there have been no external examiners' reports, responses to these, and internal quality documents produced.
- Programme design, approval, monitoring and periodic review
- Procedures for comments, suggestions and complaints - student guide
- Scheme of work - certificate in local analgesia

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: Documentation provided for this audit submission did not fully address this standard. The SETs mapping document stated that evidence could be found on page 1 of the 'Scheme of Work' (SETs Mapping, SET 4.5). The 'Scheme of Work' document stated that the "Health Professions Council guidelines" would be included under legal and ethical issues. From looking at this evidence the visitors felt that this was too vague regarding HPC standards and guidelines and were not clear where, and what, in the taught content, the programme teaches students about the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the implications of these standards. The visitors require further details regarding where, and in what context, the programme informs students of the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Detail to show where and how the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are being incorporated into the curriculum.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-03-02	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report - New College Durham - Cert LA - 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.
2011-03-02	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report - New College Durham - Cert LA - 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

Name of education provider	Newcastle University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Sciences
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Programme Specification
 - Terms of reference for the Audit and Strategy Group
 - CV for Carolyn Letts
 - SLS Generic handbook

- Stage 1, 2, 3 and 4 Handbooks
- Fitness to Practice Procedure
- ISR Report
- Terms of Reference for Clinical Education Committee, SPEC, CCC
- Stage 2, 3 and 4 Rough Guide to Clinical Education
- Specific Placement Clinical Educator Information Packs
- Clinical Competencies Framework
- Assessment criteria for 'Phonology, Semantics, Sentence Processing' case management plans Stage 2
- Assignment and marking brief for case based teaching modules
- Unseen viva guidelines Y3 and Y4

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	Newcastle University
Programme title	MSc Language Pathology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	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
 - 08-09 and 09-10 Programme Specification
 - SLS General handbook
 - Applicant Offer Letter
 - MSc Lang Path Degree Programme Handbook
 - Terms of reference for the Audit and Strategy Team

- Fitness to Practice Procedure
- Rough Guide to Clinical Education
- ISR Final 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.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	FdSc Paramedic Emergency Care
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time Mixed mode
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Paul Frowen (Chiropodist/Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Paula Lescott
Date of assessment day	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
 - Student support information
 - Quality and standards handbook
 - Appeals, complaints and conduct information

- Profession related conduct information
- HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics learning outcomes

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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted from a review of this submission that the external examiner reports for the programme do not detail the different modes of delivery for this programme. The visitors suggest, for clarity, that the external examiners reports contain this detail in order to aid future reviews of the programme documentation.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	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
 - Student Support. Extract from 10,11 OBU Student Handbooks
 - Quality and Standards Handbook
 - HSCQ 0830 Module Unit Review Template-2

- Student Complaints procedure
- Assessment compact
- Cheating, Plagiarism and Collusion policy
- Induction Timetable
- Placement Learning Unit (PLU) - School of Health and Social Care
- Profession related conduct Extract from Student Handbook
- Partnerships 3 - Module descriptor
- Checklist for induction

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Quality and standards handbook
 - Module unit review template
 - Appeals, complaints and conduct office

- Assessment compact
- Cheating, plagiarism and collusion
- Radar – Brookes Wiki
- Placement learning unit
- Profession related conduct
- Partnerships 3 module descriptor
- Checklist for induction

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.

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Reason: From the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document the visitors were unclear as to the selection and entry criteria in regards to the good command of reading, writing and spoken English. The mapping document states that the “admissions procedures still apply selection criteria and entry criteria which include evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English. An IELTS score of 6.5 (a minimum of 6 in any component) or a TOEFL 575 paper based (TOEFL 90 internet based) may be required” (SETs mapping, SET 2.2). The visitors were unclear from this as to whether the admissions procedures had changed in regards to English level entry standards or not. From looking at the website referenced as evidence by the education provider, the visitors were additionally unclear as to whether the IELTS score of 6.5 was a mandatory requirement or not for applicants. They felt that potential applicants to the programme would be uncertain as to the exact level required due to the statement “An IELTS score of 6.5.... may be required.” (<http://shsc.brookes.ac.uk/courses/undergraduate/physiotherapy>: English Language Requirements). The visitors understood that this statement may refer to international applicants who could not attain the IELTS score of 6.5 but who could still apply for the programme, however they felt this was unclear.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Therefore the visitors require further information about the English level entry requirements for the programme and if any changes have occurred.

Suggested documentation: Clarification regarding whether the level has changed or not. Clarification regarding the level of IELTS which is required for entry to the programme.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Quality and standards handbook

- Module unit review template
- Appeals, complaints and conduct office
- Assessment compact
- Cheating, plagiarism and collusion
- Placement learning unit
- Profession related conduct
- Operating department practice U42121

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	Swansea University
Programme title	Dip HE Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Sue Strand (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	1 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: In 2009 the standards of education and training (SETs) were revised and implemented. As a consequence of this revision, SET 3.13 was introduced which requires HPC approved programmes to provide evidence as to how programmes deal with complaints from students. This is the first year in which this programme should provide evidence of meeting this SET through the annual monitoring process. However, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine how the programme team deal with students' concerns. Therefore the visitors require evidence to determine what process the education provider has in place to deal with complaints made by students.

Suggested documentation: Information to provide details of the process the education provider has in place to deal with students' complaints.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted in the 'Annual monitoring of modules and programmes (AMMP)' report from 2009 against point 8(c) and (d) that there were changes to how the programme was taught and assessed. This involved the replacement of the module SHE 106 (level 1, 40 credits) with two other modules, SHE 109 and SHE 110 (level 1, 20 credits). It also included a change in the assessment of clinical outcomes with the outcomes being assessed over the course of one academic year rather than being assessed per module. The visitors also noted that these changes had not been submitted to the HPC as part of a major change and that there was no evidence regarding these changes submitted as part of this annual monitoring audit. The visitors therefore could not be sure that these changes had not affected how students, who successfully complete the programme, meet all of the appropriate standards of proficiency (SOPs). Therefore the visitors require evidence of how these changes affect how students, who successfully complete the programme, can meet all of the relevant SOPs.

Suggested documentation: Details of the previous module and the new modules and details of the new marking criteria in relation to clinical outcomes.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- the learning outcomes to be achieved;
- the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;
- expectations of professional conduct;
- the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and
- communication and lines of responsibility.

Reason: The visitors noted in the external examiners report that the student officer role in relation to practice placements was no longer in place. The visitors also noted that in the response to this the programme team had responded that discussions were on-going as to how this change was going to be managed. However the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that the line of communication between students, practice placement providers and the programme team was maintained after the removal of the student officer role. The visitors therefore require further evidence to determine how the programme team dealt with this change. This is to ensure that students were prepared for practice placement by understanding the lines of communication between themselves, practice placement providers and the programme team.

Suggested documentation: Information as to how the programme team ensure that students are fully prepared for placements by understanding the lines of communication between themselves and the programme team.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	Thames Valley University
Programme title	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Annual field Review 09-10
 - ODP Student representatives annual report 2010

- Complaints section of the Thames Valley University student handbook 2010-2011
- Faculty of health and human sciences student handbook supplement: Fitness to 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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the annual report for 2009-2010 that “in August 2010 two members of the Perioperative team left the University” (Programme annual report for 2009-2010, 7 Learning Resources). The visitors have also noted that the action plan for that report noted an objective to “evaluate the use of resources....with reduced staff numbers” (Programme annual report for 2009-2010, 10 Programme action plan). The visitors are concerned that a loss of two staff members may have a detrimental effect of the delivery of the programme, especially if there are no plans to recruit new members of staff. The visitors therefore require further clarification regarding how the programme is managing the reduced staff numbers and plans to manage the staff numbers in the future.

Suggested documentation: Further information regarding numbers of staff in place for the programme. Further information regarding how the education provider has managed the loss of two staff members and plans to manage this in the future.

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

Reason: The standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document provided for this annual monitoring submission included evidence from the education provider outlining how they meet SET 4.5. Within the SETs mapping document it stated, “whilst this SET has always been incorporated into all

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

modules there are two modules, one in the 1st year and one in the 2nd year that specifically address this SET” (SETs mapping, SET 4.5). The modules highlighted in this statement were not included within the evidence for this submission. Therefore the visitors were unable to clearly determine that this standard was being met. The visitors require further information about the two modules referenced by the education provider in order to be assured that the programmes curriculum makes sure that students understand the implications of the HPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Further information regarding the modules in the first and second year that specifically addresses this SET. This could be evidence such as module descriptors, learning outcomes, assessment details and reading lists for these modules.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University College Plymouth St Mark and St John
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	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

- Programme Specification 2010

- Yr 3 CP3a Clinical 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.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	Prescribing for Health Care Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Podiatrist) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	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
 - Complaints quick guide and home page
 - Revised complaints procedure

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.

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.
2011-04-27	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Bradford - 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

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	Pg Dip Rehabilitation Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	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.

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. The visitors noted the references given by the education provider within the standards of education and training mapping document, however they felt that the referenced documentation did not highlight the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics clearly and only made general reference to professional regulatory bodies. 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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	MSc Rehabilitation Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	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.

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. The visitors noted the references given by the education provider within the standards of education and training mapping document, however they felt that the referenced documentation did not highlight the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics clearly and only made general reference to professional regulatory bodies. 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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	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
 - Definitive BSc (Hons) course document 2007
 - General Examination and Assessment regulations GEAR 2010/2011
 - Student Course Handbook 2010/2011
 - Student University Handbook 2010/2011

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. The visitors noted the references given by the education provider within the standards of education and training mapping document, however they felt that the referenced documentation did not highlight the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics clearly and only made general reference to professional regulatory bodies. 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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Chiropodist/Podiatrist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Bob Dobson (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	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.

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

Reason: The standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document submitted by the education provider stated that students received teaching sessions on HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). The visitors were also informed that references were included in the clinical module handbooks and induction and that a working party was being set up to address strategies to promote professionalism. The visitors were referred to the 'my course BSc (Hons) Podiatry' area on the education providers Blackboard but the visitors did not receive a link to this or a print out. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether students understand the implications of HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and therefore they were unable to say whether this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Documentation to show how the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are taught within the academic and clinical training.

4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Reason: The standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document submitted by the education provider stated that there has been a new elearning strategy implemented and this was outlined in the Academic Health report 2008/2009. However the Academic Health report did not provide the visitors with detail of the learning strategy and how it continues to be appropriate to the learning outcomes of the programme. A copy of the elearning strategy was not provided. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the new strategy continued to be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Suggested Documentation: Further information about the revised elearning strategy.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted that one of the external examiners from 2008/2009, felt that the number of resits 'seemed generous'. The visitors noted that the same external examiner reporting in 2009/10 stated that the number of resits had been reduced. The second external examiner for the programme did not comment on the number of resits for either year. The visitors could not locate information outlining the new assessment regulations applicable to the number of resits and they were therefore unable to determine whether the new assessment strategy ensured that a student would continue to meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of the assessment regulations applicable to the programme.

6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: The visitors noted in the Academic Health report 2008/2009, there have been changes to the assessment strategy for several modules. The Academic Health report did not provide the visitors with information about the new assessments, how they measured the learning outcomes or the reasons for the changes. The visitors could not find any further supporting documentation that showed the revised assessment strategy. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the assessment methods employed continued to measure the learning outcomes.

Suggested documentation: Documentation showing the new assessment strategy and a rationale for the changes.

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.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Clare Brewis (Occupational therapist) Janek Dubowski (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	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 handbook: The university and you 2010-2011
 - Academic health handbook (revised 2004)
 - MSc health through occupation course handbook 2009-2011
 - General examination and assessment regulations for taught courses (GEAR)

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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted references to out of date or incorrect terminology within the programme handbook. On page 32 the visitors noted reference to "state registration", this term is no longer used with reference to registration with the HPC. On page 33 of the same document the visitors also noted an incorrect reference in the sentence "[upon] completion of the Postgraduate Diploma in Occupational Therapy you will be eligible to register with the Health Professions Council". The visitors would like the education provider to note that upon completion of the programme students are 'eligible to apply' for registration with the HPC. The visitors consider the current statement to be potentially misleading and would like the education provider to consider reviewing the documentation to ensure that it fully complies with the HPC advertising guidelines available at www.hpc-uk.org/education/providers/download.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	Supplementary Prescribing (Level 3)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Bob Dobson (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	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.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	Supplementary Prescribing (M Level)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Bob Dobson (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	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.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer)
HPC executive	Paula Lescott
Date of assessment day	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 programme was visited on 23 – 24 June 2009 so the audit contains documentation for one year.

- School of Nursing and Midwifery student handbook
- Marking criteria for level 4 assignments

- Memorandum of cooperation: University of Brighton and South East Coast Ambulance NHS Trust

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: From a review of the documentation the education provider indicated that evidence regarding the student complaints process was provided in the student handbook and the memorandum of cooperation between the education provider and the South East Coast Ambulance NHS Trust. From the documentation visitors could only determine that there was a complaints process in place for complaints arising from practice placements. The visitors therefore cannot determine if this standard is being met.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that details the student complaints process that applies to all areas of the education provider, which details how student concerns about the programme are dealt with.

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.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

- 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 noted that the documentation provided referred to HPC code of professional conduct. The correct title of this document is HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The correct title of the document should be used in all documentation in order to prevent any confusion.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Sue Strand (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	1 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
 - School of Nursing and Caring Sciences Manual
 - BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice Course Handbook
 - NU1600 – Fundamental skills for paramedic practice - Module pack
 - NU3062 – Developing primary and emergency care skills - Module pack

- NU2672 – Managing trauma & environmental emergencies - Module pack
- Course Management Committee minutes – 24 November 2010
- Programme specification
- BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice - Year 3 clinical skills log

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 2009 the standards of education and training (SETs) were revised and implemented. As a consequence of this revision, SET 3.16 was introduced which requires HPC approved programmes to provide evidence as to how they deal with concerns about students' profession related conduct. This is the first year in which this programme should provide evidence of meeting this SET through the annual monitoring process. However, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine how the programme team deal with concerns about students' profession related conduct. Therefore the visitors require evidence to determine what process the education provider has in place to deal with issues around student conduct

Suggested documentation: Information to provide details of the process the education provider has in place to deal with students' profession related conduct.

5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided that there were several references to changes in how mentors were involved with the programme leading to mentors requiring 'updates'. This was mentioned in the Course Leader's report 2009-2010. The programme team have appointed a placement education facilitator as well as introducing a licence for students to enable them to demonstrate their clinical competence. It is also the case that the external examiner also requested to review the mentorship training (External examiner's report 2008-2009.) From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine if these updates related to all of the mentors on the programme and also how many mentors these updates would apply to. The visitors were also unclear as to the relationship between doing the mentors update and continuing to be a mentor on the programme. To ensure that there are an adequate number

of mentors who are appropriately qualified and experienced at the practice placement the visitors require details of how many mentors have undertaken the mentors update.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the number of mentors who have undertaken the mentors update and are available to supervise students when they are on practice placement.

5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided that there were several references to 'mentors updates'. However the visitors could not determine if all of the mentors who supervise students on practice placement were required to undertake these updates. The visitors were also unclear as to the relationship between doing the mentors update and continuing to be a mentor on the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to determine if the mentors updates are compulsory. This is to ensure that the mentors who supervise students on practice placement are appropriately qualified and experienced.

Suggested documentation: Information to determine if the mentors updates are a compulsory requirement of being a mentor to students on this programme.

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 noted in the programme documentation that the programme leader had changed since the last annual monitoring audit. They also noted that this change of programme lead had not been communicated to the HPC. The visitors have reviewed the available evidence and are satisfied that the programme continues to meet SET 3.4. However, the visitors would like to highlight that a programme leader change should be communicated to the HPC through the

major change process. This is to ensure that there is sufficient scrutiny of this change and to ensure that the programme continues to meet this SET.

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

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	Advanced Certificate Non Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Bob Fellows (Paramedic) Brian Ellis (Chiropodist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	1 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
 - Cohort timetable
 - Course handbooks for NU3023 and NU4023

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: Documentation provided for this audit submission did not fully address this standard. The SETs mapping document indicated evidence for this SET being met was in the course handbook. The visitors could see that the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics were included in the references (Student Course Handbook NU4023, p43). However, the visitors could not see where in the taught content the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the implications of the standards were being included. The visitors require further information regarding where in the programme the students were being informed of the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Information that shows where the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are being incorporated into the curriculum.

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.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-03-02	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report - UCLan - Adv Cert SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2011-03-02	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report - UCLan - Adv Cert 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	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Katie Bosworth (Physiotherapist) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	1 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.

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

Reason: Within the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document submitted by the education provider, the visitors were directed to the following specific documentation to evidence how the education provider meets this SET;

- Annual Course Leaders Report
- Module Leaders Reports
- Module Evaluation Questionnaire
- Placement Evaluation Reports
- Minutes of Course Management Team Meetings.

The visitors did not receive this or other alternative documentation detailing the education provider's regular monitoring and evaluation systems and were therefore unable to determine whether this SET is met.

Suggested documentation: The visitors would like to receive either the documentation listed within the SETs mapping document or alternative evidence which outlines how the education provider ensures that this SET is met.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: Within the SETs mapping document submitted by the education provider, the visitors were directed to the University Student Complaint Procedure which could be found in the School of Nursing and Caring Sciences Student Handbook and Course Handbook. The visitors did not receive this or other alternative documentation detailing the education provider's student complaints process and were therefore unable to determine whether this SET is met.

Suggested documentation: The visitors would like to receive either the documentation listed within the SETs mapping document or alternative evidence which outlines how the education provider ensures that this SET is met.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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

Reason: Within the SETs mapping document submitted by the education provider, the visitors were directed to the Fitness to Practice Procedure (Professional Courses) which could be found in The Regulations for the Conduct of Students to evidence how the education provider meets this SET. The visitors did not receive this or other alternative documentation detailing the education provider's process for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct and were therefore unable to determine whether this SET is met.

Suggested documentation: The visitors would like to receive either the documentation listed within the SETs mapping document or alternative evidence which outlines how the education provider ensures that this SET is met.

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

Reason: Within the SETs mapping document submitted by the education provider, the visitors were directed to the following documentation to evidence how the education provider meets this SET;

- Information found on page 1 of the Induction Week
- Programme and in the NU1050 Module Descriptor.

The visitors did not receive this or other alternative documentation detailing how the curriculum makes sure that students understand the implications of HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPE's) and were therefore unable to determine whether this SET is met.

Suggested documentation: The visitors would like to receive either the documentation listed within the SETs mapping document or alternative evidence which outlines how the education provider ensures that this SET is met.

6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and the review of the context pack, the visitors learnt that the education provider submitted a major change notification form in December 2009. The decision from this was that the change should be assessed through the next annual monitoring audit submission. To evidence this, the education provider has directed visitors to page 7 of the course handbook. The visitors did not receive this document or other alternative information detailing the change to the assessment for module NU1054 – Consolidation of Perioperative Practice.

Suggested documentation: The visitors would like to receive either the document listed within the SETs mapping document or alternative evidence which outlines how the education provider ensures that this SET continues to be met.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	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
 - National student survey results 2009 -10
 - Practice Placement Handbooks and audit tools
 - Programme Committee Minutes
 - Programme Handbooks 2010-11 and Module Specifications

- Programme Specifications
- Staff List and CVs
- University and Faculty policies

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: The visitors noted in the documentation provided that the programme ensures students adhere to the standards of professional conduct and performance articulated by the professional body, the College of Occupational Therapists (COT). However, the visitors could not identify how the programme team ensures the students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. As this is the case the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine if the programme meets this standard.

Suggested documentation: Information to demonstrate how the programme team ensures that students on the programme understand 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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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

Through the process of scrutinising the documentation for this programme the visitors noted information provided was very comprehensive and covered most of what was required for the HPC's annual monitoring audit process. However, they would like to highlight that while the information provided addressed the majority of the needs of the annual monitoring audit, the volume of documentation provided was not required. The annual monitoring process is a retrospective one focusing on programmes with ongoing approval and as such a submission usually only consists of the required documentation as highlighted above. Any additional information is only needed when the programme has undergone changes which affect how the SETs continue to be met. The visitors would therefore like to highlight that for future audits, such comprehensive documentation would not be needed. This would enable the process of scrutinising the documentation to be expedited and would avoid unnecessary work for the education provider.

The visitors agreed that SET 4.5 was met and that students would understand the implications of issues of conduct, performance and ethics of care during their training and future professional careers. However, they would like to recommend that the programme team considers putting HPC's Standards of conduct, performance and ethics in the essential reading for the relevant module to further embed the learning around this area.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Shaaron Pratt (Radiographer) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of postal review	21 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
- Clinical Placement Handbook
 - Programme Handbook 2009-2010
 - Programme Specification September 2010
 - Module Specifications

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.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	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
 - National student survey results 2009-10
 - Practice Placement Handbooks and audit tools
 - Programme Committee Minutes

- Programme Handbooks 2010-11 and Module Specifications
- Programme Specifications
- Staff List and CVs
- University and Faculty policies

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: The visitors noted in the documentation provided that the programme ensures students adhere to the standards of professional conduct and performance articulated by the professional body, the College of Occupational Therapists (COT). However, the visitors could not identify how the programme team ensures the students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. As this is the case the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine if the programme meets this standard.

Suggested documentation: Information to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that students on the programme understand 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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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

Through the process of scrutinising the documentation for this programme the visitors noted that the information provided was very comprehensive and covered most of what was required for the HPC's annual monitoring audit process. However, they would like to highlight that while the information provided addressed the majority of the needs of the annual monitoring audit, the volume of documentation provided was not required. The annual monitoring process is a retrospective one focusing on programmes with ongoing approval and as such a submission usually only consists of the required documentation as highlighted above. Any additional information is only needed when the programme has undergone changes which affect how the SETs continue to be met. The visitors would therefore like to highlight that for future audits, such comprehensive documentation would not be needed. This would enable the process of scrutinising the documentation to be expedited and would avoid unnecessary work for the education provider.

The visitors agreed that SET 4.5 was met and that students would understand the implications of issues of conduct, performance and ethics of care during their training and future professional careers. They recommended that the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics was explicitly mentioned in the essential reading for the module.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) John Strange (Music therapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Programme specification
 - School of Health and Bioscience student handbook
 - Student handbook Physiotherapy (full and part time and situated learning)

- Manual of general regulations: suitability procedures (part 13)

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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted evidence supplied for this annual monitoring audit included information about the education providers' professional suitability procedures. The visitors noted that the standard relating to professional suitability had been met at a threshold level. However, the visitors felt that to enhance the procedures and to ensure professional suitability of students on the programme, the education provider should explore the differences between being mentally and physically able to practise and being mature enough for practise. The visitors felt the suitability procedure at present does not incorporate fully the possible outcome for the student who was pronounced both mentally and physically fit to

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

resume studies but whose behaviour would indicate professional unsuitability for practise.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Situating Learning)
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) John Strange (Music therapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Programme specification
 - School of Health and Bioscience student handbook
 - Student handbook Physiotherapy (full and part time and situated learning)

- Manual of general regulations: suitability procedures (part 13)

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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted evidence supplied for this annual monitoring audit included information about the education providers' professional suitability procedures. The visitors noted that the standard relating to professional suitability had been met at a threshold level. However, the visitors felt that to enhance the procedures and to ensure professional suitability of students on the programme, the education provider should explore the differences between being mentally and physically able to practise and being mature enough for practise. The visitors felt the suitability procedure at present does not incorporate fully the possible outcome for the student who was pronounced both mentally and physically fit to

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

resume studies but whose behaviour would indicate professional unsuitability for practise.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	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
 - School of Health and Emergency Professions Student Handbook 2010-11
 - Programme specification, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography & Imaging
 - Definitive Module Descriptors – Diagnostic

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 visitors noted in the documentation provided that the education provider has a formal student complaints process which applies to practice placements. They also noted there is a formal appeals process to address relevant academic issues. However the visitors did not have evidence of a comprehensive student complaints process which applies to all areas of the programme. Therefore the visitors did not have sufficient information to determine if the programme meets this standard.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding how the education provider ensures that there is a formal process in place to ensure that students can raise concerns about the programme. This process should apply to all areas of the programme.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided that the education provider ensures students are aware of relevant standards of conduct and performance. However the visitors were unclear as to where the education provider ensures that students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Therefore the visitors did not have sufficient information to determine if the programme meets this standard.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding how the programme ensures that students are aware of the implications of HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	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
 - Programme specification 2010
 - School student handbook 2010/11
 - CRB policy
 - Complaints procedure
 - Handling of people workbook

- Student practice educator handbook
- Audit of placement provision
- Admissions interview criteria
- 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.

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. The visitors noted the reference given by the education provider to address the standard of education and training (4.5) within the mapping document where the visitors were directed to the programme specification document on page 2 and 3. The visitors noted reference to HPC standards of education and training and HPC standards of proficiency however could not find reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors require the education provider to provide clear evidence that shows how the curriculum ensures 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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 submitted. 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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist/Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Paula Lescott
Date of assessment day	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
 - School student handbook
 - Placement complaints policy
 - 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.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted the education provider has stated that evidence regarding the monitoring and evaluation systems in place for the programme are detailed in the student handbook and the programme specification. The visitors could not see the details of these processes in the student handbook and the submission did not contain the programme specification. As the visitors have not received evidence of the monitoring and evaluation systems they cannot determine whether this standard is being met.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the monitoring and evaluation systems for the programme.

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 documentation submitted the education provider indicated that there had been no change to the programme regarding HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics as these were embedded in the programme and were therefore detailed in the module outcomes. The submission did not contain evidence of the module outcomes. As the visitors have not received evidence of how the programme ensures that students understand the implication of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics they cannot determine whether this standard is being met.

Suggested documentation: Information detailing where in the curriculum students are informed of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted the education provider indicated that there had been a change to the external examiner for the programme from Mark Woolcock to Elizabeth Hickson. The external examiner reports for this period however were completed by Peter Gregory. Due to this the visitors could not determine who the external examiner was for this period, whether they were appropriately experienced and qualified and whether they were from the relevant part of Register.

Suggested documentation: Information detailing the external examiner for the programme for the last two academic years.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	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

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 documentation provided by the education provider, the visitors noted the practice complaints policy. This policy was comprehensive and gave the students firm guidance on how to complain while on practice. The visitors could find no evidence of an education provider complaints policy to address student academic and or pastoral complaints within the documentation provided and it was not mapped within the standards of education and training. Therefore the visitors could not be sure how the students access the complaints process within the education provider. Therefore the visitors could not be sure that this standard was met.

Suggested documentation: Documentation to show that an education provider student complaints process is in place for the academic and pastoral aspects of the programme.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist/Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Paula Lescott
Date of assessment day	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
 - School student handbook
 - Placement complaints policy
 - 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.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted the education provider has stated that evidence regarding the monitoring and evaluation systems in place for the programme are detailed in the student handbook, the programme specification and the AMER (annual monitoring evaluation report). The visitors could not see the details of these processes in the student handbook or AMER and the submission did not contain the programme specification. As the visitors have not received evidence of the monitoring and evaluation systems they cannot determine whether this standard is being met.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the monitoring and evaluation systems for the programme.

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 documentation submitted the education provider indicated that there had been no change to the programme regarding HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics as these were embedded in the programme and were therefore detailed in the module outcomes. The submission did not contain evidence of the module outcomes. As the visitors have not received evidence of how the programme ensures that students understand the implication of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics they cannot determine whether this standard is being met.

Suggested documentation: Information detailing where in the curriculum students are informed of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted the education provider indicated that there had been a change to the external examiner for the programme from Mark Woolcock to Elizabeth Hickson. The external examiner reports for this period however were completed by Peter Gregory. Due to this the visitors could not determine who the external examiner was for this period, whether they were appropriately experienced and qualified and whether they were from the relevant part of Register.

Suggested documentation: Information detailing the external examiner for the programme for the last two academic years.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	MA Art Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Art therapist
Relevant modality	Art therapy
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Clare Brewis (Occupational therapist) Janek Dubowski (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	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
 - Visiting tutor placement audit form
 - Student placement audit form
 - Staff CVs
 - Student appeals and complaints procedure
 - Clinical placement and supervision handbook

- Programme DMD modules
- General information on the MA Art Therapy
- Preparation for placement workshops
- First year lecture series
- Preparation for placement workshops
- Placement provider workshops
- Clinical placement dates
- Placement provider advice on assessment 2008-2010
- Letters of eligibility to progress

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

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted there was a clear procedure for student appeals. The visitors could not however, determine if there was a clear process in place for student complaints. The visitors require further evidence that outlines the mechanisms the education providers has in place to ensure that it can deal with students concerns about the programme or a related service, as well as allegations of harassment or discrimination.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of a student complaints process.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	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 handbook
 - Fitness to practice policy
 - Practise complaints policy
 - Practice placement pack
 - Excerpt from Definitive Module Document

- Programme specification

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Non Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Paul Frowen (Chiropodist/Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Paula Lescott
Date of assessment day	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
 - Admissions information
 - Programme handbook
 - Student complaints policy
 - Fitness to practise 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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	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
 - BSc (H) Occupational Therapy - Programme specification
 - HFP1008 - Module descriptor
 - HFT1012 - Module descriptor

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: From a review of the documentation provided, the visitors noted there is a university wide process in place to deal with concerns about students' profession related conduct. However, as the process is a high-level university wide procedure the visitors were unclear as to how this process applied to students undertaking programme specific practice placements. As the process for dealing with these concerns is required to be in place throughout the programme the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine if the programme meets this standard.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the process of dealing with concerns about students' profession related conduct while they are undertaking programme specific practice placements. This information should articulate how the process of dealing with concerns regarding students' professional conduct while on placement relates to the high-level university wide procedure.

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.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Podiatrist/Chiropodist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Podiatrist) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	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
 - University of Huddersfield Partnership Statement
 - Professional Misconduct Form
 - Students Complaints Procedure
 - Student Regulations and R&PD module handbooks

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.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Programme specification document
 - CV's for S. Chipperfield, E. Knott and A. Moreno

- Student handbook of regulations, Section 8 Students complaints procedure
- Fitness to practise handbook
- BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy Year 1 Handbook
- Module specifications for
 - HFP1008 Professional development and research 1
 - HFT1015 Clinical skills 1
 - HHP1016 Research 3
- Clinical assessment document level 2

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document provided for this annual monitoring submission detailed a programme leader change which occurred in September 2010. The education provider did not inform the HPC of this change at the time. The visitors are satisfied that the new programme leader meets the SET which would have been possibly affected by this change. However the visitors wish to point out that the HPC should have been informed of a change of this nature as this would have been considered a change that may have been easily assessed through the major change process.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	Pg Dip Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Programme specification
 - CV's for E. Knott and A. Moreno
 - Student handbook of regulations, Section 8 Student complaints procedure
 - Fitness to practise handbook

- PGDip Physiotherapy Year Handbook
- Clinical assessment Document level 2
- Module specifications for:
 - HMT1003 Clinical skills
 - HMT1007

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	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
 - HHS – Student Handbook 2010-2011 (School Student Handbook)
 - Dip HE in ODP Handbook – 2011 (Course Student Handbook)
 - Matching ODP SOP to Modules (Matrix showing where SOPs are addressed within modules)

- PDP 3 August 2010 (Assessment document for placement 3 – second year)
- PROG SPEC December 2006 (Programme Specification document)
- APPENDIX 8 Mapping to CODP Curriculum (Matrix demonstrating where CODP curriculum requirements are located within course documentation)
- S White CV 2011 (CV of course leader)
- HHF1031 April 2007 (Module Specification of “Supporting Learning in Practice” module – mentor preparation module)
- Mod spec HHO1014 (Module Specification – Creating a Supportive Learning Environment in the Operating Theatre a “top-up” qualification for assessors)
- Mod Spec HIO1020 (Module Specification – Professional Practice & Lifelong Learning Skills)
- Students consent to act as models (consent form signed by students – agreement to involvement in practical sessions)
- Terms of ref PPQC

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. The visitors noted the references given by the education provider to module H101020 within the standards of education and training mapping document, however they felt that the referenced documentation did not highlight the HPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics clearly and only made general reference to professional regulation. 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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

the education provider ensures that students understand 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.

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. 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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Paul Blakeman (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	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
 - Accountability and Negligence – Presentation

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.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	Clinical Pharmacology for Podiatrists
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Prescription only medicine
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Bob Dobson (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Students' Complaints procedure
 - Professional conduct in clinical placements
 - Module descriptors

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Leeds
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	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
 - Undergraduate Admissions Policy
 - Michelle Ellwood CV
 - Student Complaints Procedure

- Student Professional Conduct Process

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: Within the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to ensure that the students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. While the education provider identified where evidence to support the programme in meeting this standard could be found (Original Course Validation Document, p 171) the visitors did not have a copy of this document. Due to the lack of this document within the information provided, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine if the programme meets this standard.

Suggested documentation: Information to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics such as a copy of the original course validation document (as was articulated in the SETs mapping.)

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.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

- 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

In reading the documentation both visitors wish to recommend that to further embed the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics in the teaching and learning on the programme the relevant HPC publications should be included in the reading list for the unit 'Role of the Healthcare Professional – Preparation for Practice'.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	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
 - Fitness to practice procedures (May 2010)
 - HPC e-learning session 2010
 - Extract from school HPC welcome (1)
 - Student complaints process

- IPL year 3 Semester 2 (2011)
- Module evaluations 2008-09 and 2009-10

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	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
 - CVs for Bridget Porritt and Jamie Harle
 - Fitness to practice procedures (May 2010) and Student complaints process

- HPC e-learning session 2010
- IPL year 3 Semester 2 - final revised timetable (2011)
- Placement Student Evaluation
- Radiotherapy – Year 1 calendar
- RADT111 and RAD311 Module Specifications
- School Handbook 2010-11
- Summary of RT Module Evaluations (2009)
- Summary of Y3PG Evaluations for BB (2010)
- University welcome slides 1 and 2

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) John Strange (Music therapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Notes from evaluation meetings February and July 2010
 - Examples: module evaluation form and minutes from staff student forum
 - Student complaints procedure and fitness to practice procedures guide 2010

- IPL year 3: E-learning exercise and lecture session
- Timetable indicating lecture session year 2 module: PHTY 224
- Powerpoint presentation IPL session year 1 and Extract from Head of School 'Welcome' powerpoint presentation

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	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
 - APMRs 08/09 and 09/10; sample evaluation summaries – academic, clinical and User focus group
 - Staff CVs

- School of Health Sciences Student handbook,
- Students Complaints Procedure
- Fitness to Practise Procedures Guide
- Powerpoint slides, module descriptors, sample timetables, E learning information

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Katie Bosworth (Physiotherapist) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	1 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
 - Module evaluation reports
 - Final assessment forms
 - Intermediate feedback forms.
 - The education provider did not submit a response to external examiner's report for two years due to circumstances beyond their control, as outlined

in the letter dated 9 February 2011. The visitors were satisfied with the explanation and noted no areas for response within the external examiners 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: Within the SETs mapping document submitted by the education provider, the visitors were directed to the University Student Complaint Procedure which could be found in the School of Nursing and Caring Sciences Student Handbook and Course Handbook. The visitors did not receive this or other alternative documentation detailing the education provider’s student complaints process and were therefore unable to determine whether this SET is met.

Suggested documentation: The visitors would like to receive either the documentation listed within the SETs mapping document or alternative evidence which outlines how the education provider ensures that this SET is met.

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

Reason: Within the SETs mapping document submitted by the education provider, the visitors were directed to the following documentation to evidence how this SET is met:

- Personal & Professional Development 1 (PPD1) Handbook (attached)
- PPD2 Module specification (attached)
- PPD3 Module Handbook (attached)
- Clinical Education Handbook (page 13)

The visitors reviewed these documents but could not locate the specific links to HPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether this SET was met.

Suggested documentation: Provide clarification of where the information about HPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics can be found within this

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

documentation. Alternatively provide other programme documentation to show how this SET is met.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
Programme title	Masters of Nutrition (MNutr)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	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
 - Code of practice for student complaints
 - Copy of fitness to practice workshop
 - Copy of presentation on HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
Programme title	Masters of Nutrition (Mnutr)
Mode of delivery	Full time accelerated
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	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
 - Code of practice for student complaints
 - Copy of fitness to practice workshop
 - Copy of presentation on HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	Prescription only Medicine for Podiatrists
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Prescription only medicine
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Alison Wishart (Podiatrist) Jim Pickard (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of postal review	14 April 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
 - Students complaints procedure
 - Fitness to Practice procedure
 - Lecture notes (Prescription only Medicine for Podiatrists and Drugs and the Law)

- Module evaluation
- HPC Booklet - Guidance on Conduct and Ethics for students

The programme did not run in 2008-2009 so only one year of annual monitoring documentation was provided.

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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors note from the education providers internal quality report that, the course was run only for all members of clinical staff from one organisation, and attended as a management dictate. The student feedback, therefore, maybe somewhat limited and biased. As the education provider has reported issues with effective student feedback from the BSc programme the visitors would like to

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-04-26	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Salford - POM - PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

suggest that feedback from future cohorts be scrutinised to ensure effective processes are in place to gather and act on student feedback.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-04-26	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Salford - POM - PT	Draft 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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	Access and Supply Pharmacology (AandS POMs)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Prescription only medicine
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Frowen (Chiropodist/Podiatrist) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Paula Lescott
Date of assessment day	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
 - Faculty APEL policy
 - Governance committee structure
 - Module assessment reports
 - Fitness to practice policy

- Faculty technology enhanced learning strategy

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.

3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted the education provider has indicated that there has been a change to the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme from Mike Potter to Alan Borthwick. The education provider has not submitted information regarding this change before therefore the visitors cannot determine whether this standard is being met.

Suggested documentation: Information clarifying the named programme leader for this programme, whether they are on the relevant part of the Register and information regarding their qualifications and experience.

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.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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 wished to remind the education provider that changes to programme leaders are considered major changes to programmes by the HPC. In future the education provider should submit a change notification form detailing changes of this nature.

The visitors noted that the dates provided in references to HPC documents within the documentation submitted were not always the most recent versions of these publications. In particular the fitness to practice policy on one occasion dates the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics as 2004 not 2008 as referred to elsewhere in this policy document.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Clare Brewis (Occupational therapist) Janek Dubowski (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	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
 - AHP Approval document
 - AHP admissions policy
 - Fitness to practice policy
 - Offer letter and enclosures/open day
 - School prospectus

- School health and safety policy
 - Faculty of health science APeL
 - School Strategic plan 2009/10
 - Learning and teaching review and action plan
 - Job descriptors
 - School board
 - Programme committee meeting
-
- Staff CV's
 - SLA/SPLA
 - Clinical educators experts group
 - Faculty of health science TEL Strategy
 - Student experience questionnaire
 - Evaluation policy
 - Module assessment reports
 - Student academic and personal review policy
 - Student reference group minutes and focus group
 - Student consent documentation and forms - self disclosure form
 - CRB monitoring
 - Student self-disclosure form (yearly)
 - Student placement handbook
 - Governance committee structure

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:

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

- 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 were satisfied that evidence provided for this annual monitoring demonstrated that the programme continues to meet the Standards of education and training (SETs). However, the visitors wish the programme team to note that the nature of this submission was not entirely conducive to an assessment of this kind. The amount of different documents including some whose relevance was not clear posed difficulties for the visitors being able to effectively assess the history of the programme across the past two academic years. The visitors felt the referencing to specific documents in the SETs mapping document could have been improved with the hardcopy documents being labelled with their relevant number allowing for easier accessing when scrutinising the documents for particular evidence. The visitors wish the programme team to take under advisement that they only submit relevant documentation and clearly label the hardcopy documents submitted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Chiropodist/Podiatrist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Bob Dobson (Paramedic) Paul Frowen (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Revised admissions policy
 - Focus group minutes/reference group
 - Placement strategy
 - SEQ and student satisfaction survey

- Module feedback forms
- Information for students package
- Practice Learning Committee Actions
- CRB process
- Policy document for Fitness to practice
- School brochure
- Strategic plan
- Calendar of QA Committees and terms of reference
- Role description for Programme Lead
- Minutes of School Board
- Minutes for programme committees
- Student experience questionnaires

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.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

- 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 were satisfied that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). However the visitors wished to point out that comprehensive nature of the submission, which provided evidence for each HPC approved programme, was not entirely conducive to their review of the BSc (Hons) Podiatry programme in order to come to their decision. Also the significant amount of additional documentation was not entirely conducive to the visitors' decision making process. The visitors would like to highlight that the annual monitoring process is a retrospective one focusing on programmes with ongoing approval and as such a submission should consist of the required documentation highlighted at the front of this report. Additional documentation is only required when the programme has undergone a change or changes in how the programme continues to meet the SETs.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) John Strange (Music therapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Policy documents
 - Advertising and admissions material, CRB Monitoring, Students yearly self-disclosure form

- Programme management evidence
- Student consent documentation and forms - self disclosure form
- Student placement handbook
- Strategy for Enhancing technology
- Information about Student Learning Advisors (SLA) and Student Practice Learning Advisors (SPLA)

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: The documentation submitted for this annual monitoring submission referenced particular modules to provide evidence that this standard was met. From looking at the module descriptors for the programme (modules HPRS3011, HPRS2013 and HPRS3013 – Document 1) the visitors were unclear as to how the module content and learning outcomes would sufficiently ensure students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The modules did not reference the Health Professions Council and did not include the standards of conduct, performance and ethics or the HPC guidance on conduct and ethics for students. The visitors could not find evidence this standard was within the documentation due to the large amount of documents received. Therefore the visitors require further evidence that clearly demonstrates how the education provider ensures that students are taught the implications of the HPC standards of conduct performance and ethics and understand them.

Suggested documentation: Detailed module information that shows how the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are being included in the curriculum and the students understanding of them is ensured.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 were satisfied that evidence provided for this annual monitoring demonstrated the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). However, the visitors wish to note for the programme team the nature of this submission was not entirely conducive to an assessment of this kind. The amount of different documents including some whose relevance was not clear posed difficulties for the visitors being able to effectively assess the history of the programme across the past two academic years. The visitors felt the referencing to specific documents in the SETs mapping document could have been improved with the hardcopy documents being labelled with their relevant number allowing for easier accessing when scrutinising the documents for particular evidence. The visitors wish the programme team to take under advisement the suggestion that they only submit relevant documentation and clearly label the hardcopy documents submitted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) John Strange (Music therapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Policy documents
 - Advertising and admissions material, CRB Monitoring, Students yearly self-disclosure form
 - Programme management evidence

- Student consent documentation and forms - self disclosure form
- Student placement handbook
- Strategy for Enhancing technology
- Information about Student Learning Advisors (SLA) and Student Practice Learning Advisors (SPLA)

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: The documentation submitted for this annual monitoring submission referenced particular modules to provide evidence that this standard was met. From looking at the module descriptors for the programme (modules HPRS3011, HPRS2013 and HPRS3013 – Document 1) the visitors were unclear as to how the module content and learning outcomes would sufficiently ensure students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The modules did not reference the Health Professions Council and did not include the standards of conduct, performance and ethics or the HPC guidance on conduct and ethics for students. The visitors could not find evidence this standard was within the documentation due to the large amount of documents received. Therefore the visitors require further evidence that clearly demonstrates how the education provider ensures that students are taught the implications of the HPC standards of conduct performance and ethics and understand them.

Suggested documentation: Detailed module information that shows how the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are being included in the curriculum and the students understanding of them is ensured.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 were satisfied that evidence provided for this annual monitoring demonstrated the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). However, the visitors wish to note for the programme team the nature of this submission was not entirely conducive to an assessment of this kind. The amount of different documents including some whose relevance was not clear posed difficulties for the visitors being able to effectively assess the history of the programme across the past two academic years. The visitors felt the referencing to specific documents in the SETs mapping document could have been improved with the hardcopy documents being labelled with their relevant number allowing for easier accessing when scrutinising the documents for particular evidence. The visitors wish the programme team to take under advisement the suggestion that they only submit relevant documentation and clearly label the hardcopy documents submitted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) John Strange (Music therapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Policy documents
 - Advertising and admissions material, CRB Monitoring, Students yearly self-disclosure form

- Programme management evidence
- Student consent documentation and forms - self disclosure form
- Student placement handbook
- Strategy for Enhancing technology
- Information about Student Learning Advisors (SLA) and Student Practice Learning Advisors (SPLA)

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: The documentation submitted for this annual monitoring submission referenced particular modules to provide evidence that this standard was met. From looking at the module descriptors for the programme (modules HPRS3011, HPRS2013 and HPRS3013 – Document 1) the visitors were unclear as to how the module content and learning outcomes would sufficiently ensure students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The modules did not reference the Health Professions Council and did not include the standards of conduct, performance and ethics or the HPC guidance on conduct and ethics for students. The visitors could not find evidence this standard was within the documentation due to the large amount of documents received. Therefore the visitors require further evidence that clearly demonstrates how the education provider ensures that students are taught the implications of the HPC standards of conduct performance and ethics and understand them.

Suggested documentation: Detailed module information that shows how the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are being included in the curriculum and the students understanding of them is ensured.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 were satisfied that evidence provided for this annual monitoring demonstrated the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). However, the visitors wish to note for the programme team the nature of this submission was not entirely conducive to an assessment of this kind. The amount of different documents including some whose relevance was not clear posed difficulties for the visitors being able to effectively assess the history of the programme across the past two academic years. The visitors felt the referencing to specific documents in the SETs mapping document could have been improved with the hardcopy documents being labelled with their relevant number allowing for easier accessing when scrutinising the documents for particular evidence. The visitors wish the programme team to take under advisement the suggestion that they only submit relevant documentation and clearly label the hardcopy documents submitted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Clare Brewis (Occupational therapist) Janek Dubowski (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	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
 - AHP Approval document
 - AHP admissions policy
 - Fitness to practice policy
 - Offer letter and enclosures/open day
 - School prospectus

- School health and safety policy
 - Faculty of health science APeL
 - School Strategic plan 2009/10
 - Learning and teaching review and action plan
 - Job descriptors
 - School board
 - Programme committee meeting
-
- Staff CV's
 - SLA/SPLA
 - Clinical educators experts group
 - Faculty of health science TEL Strategy
 - Student experience questionnaire
 - Evaluation policy
 - Module assessment reports
 - Student academic and personal review policy
 - Student reference group minutes and focus group
 - Student consent documentation and forms - self disclosure form
 - CRB monitoring
 - Student self-disclosure form (yearly)
 - Student placement handbook
 - Governance committee structure

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:

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

- 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 were satisfied that evidence provided for this annual monitoring demonstrated that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). However, the visitors wish the programme team to note that the nature of this submission was not entirely conducive to an assessment of this kind. The amount of different documents including some whose relevance was not clear posed difficulties for the visitors being able to effectively assess the history of the programme across the past two academic years. The visitors felt the referencing to specific documents in the SETs mapping document could have been improved with the hardcopy documents being labelled with their relevant number allowing for easier accessing when scrutinising the documents for particular evidence. The visitors wish the programme team to take under advisement that they only submit relevant documentation and clearly label the hardcopy documents submitted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Chiropodist/Podiatrist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Bob Dobson (Paramedic) Paul Frowen (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Revised admissions policy
 - Focus group minutes/reference group
 - Placement strategy
 - SEQ and student satisfaction survey

- Module feedback forms
- Information for students package
- Practice Learning Committee Actions
- CRB process
- Policy document for Fitness to practice
- School brochure
- Strategic plan
- Calendar of QA Committees and terms of reference
- Role description for Programme Lead
- Minutes of School Board
- Minutes for programme committees
- Student experience questionnaires

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.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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 were satisfied that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). However the visitors wished to point out that comprehensive nature of the submission, which provided evidence for each HPC approved programme, was not entirely conducive to their review of the MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration) programme in order to come to their decision. Also the significant amount of additional documentation was not entirely conducive to the visitors' decision making process. The visitors would like to highlight that the annual monitoring process is a retrospective one focusing on programmes with ongoing approval and as such a submission should consist of the required documentation highlighted at the front of this report. Additional documentation is only required when the programme has undergone a change or changes in how the programme continues to meet the SETs.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Clare Brewis (Occupational therapist) Janek Dubowski (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	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
 - AHP Approval document
 - AHP admissions policy
 - Fitness to practice policy
 - Offer letter and enclosures/open day
 - School prospectus

- School health and safety policy
 - Faculty of health science APeL
 - School Strategic plan 2009/10
 - Learning and teaching review and action plan
 - Job descriptors
 - School board
 - Programme committee meeting
-
- Staff CV's
 - SLA/SPLA
 - Clinical educators experts group
 - Faculty of health science TEL Strategy
 - Student experience questionnaire
 - Evaluation policy
 - Module assessment reports
 - Student academic and personal review policy
 - Student reference group minutes and focus group
 - Student consent documentation and forms - self disclosure form
 - CRB monitoring
 - Student self-disclosure form (yearly)
 - Student placement handbook
 - Governance committee structure

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:

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

- 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 were satisfied that evidence provided for this annual monitoring demonstrated that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). However, the visitors wish the programme team to note that the nature of this submission was not entirely conducive to an assessment of this kind. The amount of different documents including some whose relevance was not clear posed difficulties for the visitors being able to effectively assess the history of the programme across the past two academic years. The visitors felt the referencing to specific documents in the SETs mapping document could have been improved with the hardcopy documents being labelled with their relevant number allowing for easier accessing when scrutinising the documents for particular evidence. The visitors wish the programme team to take under advisement that they only submit relevant documentation and clearly label the hardcopy documents submitted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	Pg Dip Podiatry (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Chiropodist/Podiatrist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Bob Dobson (Paramedic) Paul Frowen (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Revised admissions policy
 - Focus group minutes/reference group
 - Placement strategy
 - SEQ and student satisfaction survey

- Module feedback forms
- Information for students package
- Practice Learning Committee Actions
- CRB process
- Policy document for Fitness to practice
- School brochure
- Strategic plan
- Calendar of QA Committees and terms of reference
- Role description for Programme Lead
- Minutes of School Board
- Minutes for programme committees
- Student experience questionnaires

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.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

- 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 were satisfied that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). However the visitors wished to point out that comprehensive nature of the submission, which provided evidence for each HPC approved programme, was not entirely conducive to their review of the Pg Dip Podiatry (Pre-registration) programme in order to come to their decision. Also the significant amount of additional documentation was not entirely conducive to the visitors' decision making process. The visitors would like to highlight that the annual monitoring process is a retrospective one focusing on programmes with ongoing approval and as such a submission should consist of the required documentation highlighted at the front of this report. Additional documentation is only required when the programme has undergone a change or changes in how the programme continues to meet the SETs.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Surrey
Programme title	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Appendix 1 Director of studies CV
 - Appendix 2 Programme handbook

- Appendix 3 Mapping document against the standards for education and training

The education provider did not submit a response to the external examiner's report for two years ago. There was no explanation for this provided.

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

6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Reason: The standard documentation required for an HPC annual monitoring assessment requires the education provider to submit external examiner reports and responses to those reports for the past two academic years. For this submission the education provider has submitted two external examiner reports for 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, however the content of these reports is identical. The reports are stamped with identical dates for receipt by the education provider. The education provider has submitted a response to the external examiner report for 2009-2010 and has not submitted the response to the report for 2008-2009. The visitors are aware that in some circumstances it may not be possible to submit all external examiner reports and responses however feel an explanation for a missing document should be provided. Due to the duplication of the external examiner report and the absence of the external examiner response for 2008-2009, the visitors are concerned that the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment for this programme are not effective.

Suggested documentation: Clarification about the documents received. External examiners reports for 2008-2009 and 2009-2010. Responses to the external examiners report for 2008-2009.

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)

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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 noted from the documentation that the programme had a target student intake of 42 for the academic year starting in September 2010 (Annual Programme review for Academic Year 2009-10 – 2 Student recruitment against targets). As part of this submission the visitors have access to previous HPC approval reports. The report written for the HPC approval visit in May 2007 indicated the intake for the following cohort to be 35. The visitors were satisfied with this annual monitoring review however would like to point out for the programme team that increases of student intakes may be considered a major change if the increase is of 25% or more. The visitors suggest to the programme team they ensure they inform the HPC of increases to student numbers if appropriate.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Clinical)
Mode of delivery	Full time Block release
Relevant part of HPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	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
- Faculty of Health and Life Sciences' Procedures for Quality Assurance
- Faculty Rules of Procedure and Proceedings with respect to Professional Suitability Panel and Remit of the Professional Scrutiny Panel

- Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Code of Practice for Health & Safety of Students on Placement
- Placement Handbook
- Major Change submission from 28 April 2010 concerning the condonation procedures and notification of the visitors' recommendation

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	Prescribing Principles (Level 3)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Paul Frowen (Chiropodist/Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Paula Lescott
Date of assessment day	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.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	Prescribing Principles (M Level)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Paul Frowen (Chiropodist/Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Paula Lescott
Date of assessment day	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.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	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	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	MA Music Therapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Music therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	John Strange (Music therapist) Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	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
 - Professional placement handbook
 - Programme handbook 2010-2013

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.

3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

Reason: The documentation submitted for this annual monitoring submission included programme reports for 2008-2009 and 2009-2010. The visitors noted the Programme Report 2008-2009 refers to a campus move in 2009 which the HPC had not been informed of, “the move to the Glenside Campus took place over Summer 2009 (1H13 for the teaching space and 2H05 for the office for the core staff JL, CW and LB)” and as part of the move “all music therapy library stock moved from St Matthias to Glenside” (Programme report 2008-09, p2). The visitors are concerned that a programme move could have significant impacts on the SETs. The visitors have additionally noted that a “resource paper focussing on staff and space resources in relation to student numbers” had been presented to the Executive in July 2010 (programme report 2009-2010, p17). The resource paper has not been included alongside evidence for this submission. The report documented that a “request for [a] new Business Plan” (programme report 2009-2010, p17) had been made and was noted as point of ongoing action from December 2010. From the lack of information about the programme move and the Resource paper the visitors were uncertain whether the Resource paper had been drawn together in response to the programme move. In light of the visitors’ concerns resulting from the programme move and the unknown details of the Resource paper, the visitors require further evidence that the resources to support student learning in all settings are being effectively used. The visitors require further information including details of the move, resource implications of the move and details about the request for the new Business plan.

Suggested documentation: Details about the campus move in relation to resources, rooms and equipment. A copy of the Resources paper presented to the education provider Executive and response, if available. Details of the ongoing plans for the new Business plan.

3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Reason: The documentation submitted for this annual monitoring submission included programme reports for 2008-2009 and 2009-2010. The visitors noted the Programme Report 2008-2009 refers to a campus move in September 2009 which the HPC had not been informed of, “the move to the Glenside Campus took place over Summer 2009 (1H13 for the teaching space and 2H05 for the office for the core staff JL, CW and LB)” and as part of the move “all music therapy library stock moved from St Matthias to Glenside” (Programme report 2008-09, p2). The visitors are concerned that a programme move could have significant impacts on the SETs. The visitors have additionally noted that a “resource paper focussing on staff and space resources in relation to student numbers” had been presented to the education provider executive in July 2010 (programme report 2009-2010, p17). The resource paper has not been included alongside evidence for this submission. The programme report documented that a “request for [a] new Business Plan” (2009-2010, p17) had been made and was noted as a point of ongoing action from December 2010. From the lack of information about the programme move and the Resource paper the visitors were uncertain whether the Resource paper had been drawn together in response to the programme move. In light of the visitors’ concerns resulting from the programme move and the unknown details of the resource paper, the visitors require further evidence that the resources continue to effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. The visitors require further information, including details of the move, resource implications of the move and details about the request for the new Business plan.

Suggested documentation: Details about the campus move in relation to resources, rooms and equipment. A copy of the Resources paper presented to the education provider Executive and response, if available. Details of the ongoing plans for the new Business plan.

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

Reason: Evidence submitted for this annual monitoring audit submission included a standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document which indicated that if concerns are raised about a student’s profession related conduct it would be dealt with through the regular contact between “internal music therapy supervisors and placement managers” (SETs mapping, SET 3.16). The evidence supplied also indicated that for “persistent” problems the education provider-wide professional suitability panel would be used to deal with problems. The visitors were satisfied there was an education provider wide suitability panel process. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there would be processes in place for the programme team to be able to deal directly with the student and placement manager before needing to involve the professional suitability panel. The visitors feel such processes need to be in place in order that any issues regarding students’ professional conduct can be dealt with appropriately at the programme level without recourse to the education provider’s suitability panel.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Suggested documentation: Further information regarding processes in place for the programme team to deal with issues of concern around students' profession related conduct before involving the professional suitability panel.

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.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None