

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bournemouth
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Sarah Johnson (Occupational therapist) Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Nicola Baker
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bournemouth
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Amal Hussein
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Placement environment profile (PEP) User Guide
  - Placements on the web (POW) User Guide for Academics
  - Physiotherapy Shortlisting Criteria 2012 and 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.

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Bournemouth University
<b>Programme title</b>	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Bournemouth University
<b>Programme title</b>	FdSc Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

#### **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 Internal Audit Documents (2010-11) that there have been concerns regarding the teaching team being limited in terms of the number of staff. This is reflected on page 6 of the document where the action plan indicates that there has been a request for further tutor staff in September 2011, and that this was being considered by the school. The visitors could not see evidence of the current number of staff in place and if the issue of limited staff numbers has now been resolved.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information indicating the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff that are currently in place.

### 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 five: Visitors' comments .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Bournemouth University
<b>Programme title</b>	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals (Non-Medical Prescribing)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Gordon Burrows (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

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

The visitors were satisfied after reviewing the documentation that there had not been a change to how SET 6.1 continues to be met. However, they would like to note that it would be useful for future audits to state that there had been 'no change' to the way in which the SET has been met in the SETs mapping document. This would be useful for visitors when they are looking through the documentation.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Canterbury Christ Church University
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Programme Handbook 2012/13 (for background information)
  - Assessment Handbook 2012/13

- SHA (funder) quality monitoring document (N.B. We complete quality monitoring for South East Coast SHA which commissions the majority of our places. This SHA passes the information to NHS London, the body which commissions the remainder of our funded places).
- Selection Committee Minutes from October 2012
- Paper entitled Additional Support for Preparation of Section A of the Major Research Project, October 2012
- Staff Curriculum vitae

### **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.

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

The visitors noted in their reading of the documentation that the education provider is looking to accept self-funding trainees to the programme for the 2013 – 2014 academic session. As this is a new initiative, the visitors would like to remind the education provider that the HCPC will need to review the implications of self-funders on the programme, how any potential applicant via this route will be managed and how they will progress through the programme including, but not limited to, practice placements. The education provider should submit details of this change in line with the major change process.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Coventry University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Biomedical Scientist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Academic engagement university protocol
  - New academic staff curriculum vitae
  - Module 113BMS: Skills in Biomedical Science

### **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.

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

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors noted the concerns regarding “weaker students” being “disadvantaged” which were raised in the external examiner reports, responses to the reports and in the internal quality monitoring reports for 2011-2012. In particular the issue of first semester examination resits being scheduled to take place in the second semester examination period was highlighted as disadvantaging referred and deferred students. The visitors note that the programme team are aware urgent action is necessary and have requested this be taken forward by senior management and the academic registry. The visitors however could not determine whether actions have been taken forward to resolve or relieve the situation since these reports. As a result of this, the visitors could not determine how the monitoring and evaluation systems in place for this programme were being used effectively and so require further information to demonstrate how the programme is managing these concerns raised by the external examiners.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information regarding the issues raised by the external examiners, including an update on how the programme team is managing the concerns noted above.

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Coventry University
<b>Programme title</b>	Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 3)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Gordon Burrows (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Curriculum vitae for Dr Satyadit Das



### **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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Coventry University
<b>Programme title</b>	Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing (M Level)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Gordon Burrows (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Curriculum vitae for Dr Satyadit Das

### **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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	De Montfort University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Human Communications – Speech and Language Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Jeanette Seaman (Speech and language therapist) Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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 SLT prospectus entry

- Appendix 2 Module Modification Change form
- Appendix 3 Archived Course template. Current and archived
- Appendix 4 Explanatory notes for quality monitoring mechanisms
- Appendix 5 Periodic Review report and Enhancement Plan
- Appendix 6 Programme enhancement plan (PEP) 12-13
- Appendix 7 Alison Tempest's CV
- Appendix 8 SoPs mapping document for Programme Learning outcomes, 1211 changes
- Appendix 9 Curriculum Modification form for SALT1211
- Appendix 10 Module templates. Current 1211. Archived 1005.1011
- Appendix 11 Explanatory note HCPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics
- Appendix 12 PMB terms of reference, membership 11-12 and agenda

### **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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Section two: Submission details .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Section three: Additional documentation .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	De Montfort University
<b>Programme title</b>	Prescribing for Healthcare Professionals (Level 3)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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 template (Appendix 7)
  - SETs Mapping 13.09.12 (Appendix 8)
  - SETs Mapping 22.03.11 (Appendix 9)

### **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.

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

**Reason:** The SETs mapping document attached to the HCPC Annual monitoring audit form refers to changes to resources brought about by the move of campus from the Charles Frears Campus to the City Campus in the academic year 2011-12. Under the section where this evidence can be found, the visitors were referred to a previous major change mapping document, which then refers to various appendices which were not submitted with the documentation for this audit. The visitors were therefore unable to ensure that the resources to support students' learning in all settings are being effectively used.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors would need to see evidence to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met. Evidence provided could be the documents listed in Appendix 9 (Major Change Standards of Education and Training Mapping Template) that was not submitted within this audit, namely Appendix 1 – Plans for Bosworth House, Appendix 2 – Classrooms and lecture theatres at the City campus, Appendix 3 – Resources additional information and Appendix 4 – Original prescribing curriculum.

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

**Reason:** The SETs mapping document attached to the HCPC Annual monitoring audit form refers to changes to resources brought about by the move of campus from the Charles Frears Campus to the City Campus in the academic year 2011-12. Under the section where this evidence can be found, the visitors were referred to a previous major change mapping document, which then refers to various appendices which were not submitted with the documentation for this audit. The visitors were therefore unable to ensure that adequate resources are available to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors would need to see evidence to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met. Evidence provided could be the documents listed in Appendix 9 (Major Change Standards of Education and Training Mapping Template) that was not submitted within this audit, namely Appendix 1 – Plans for Bosworth House, Appendix 2 – Classrooms and lecture theatres at the City campus, Appendix 3 – Resources additional information and Appendix 4 – Original prescribing curriculum.

### **3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.**

**Reason:** The SETs mapping document attached to the HCPC Annual monitoring audit form refers to changes to resources brought about by the move of campus from the Charles Frears Campus to the City Campus in the academic year 2011-12. Under the section where this evidence can be found, the visitors were referred to a previous major change mapping document, which then refers to various appendices which were not submitted with the documentation for this audit. The visitors were unable to be sure if the learning resources are appropriate to the curriculum and available for both students and staff.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors would need to see evidence to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met. Evidence provided could be the documents listed in Appendix 9 (Major Change Standards of Education and Training Mapping Template) that was not submitted within this audit, namely Appendix 1 – Plans for Bosworth House, Appendix 2 – Classrooms and lecture theatres at the City campus, Appendix 3 – Resources additional information and Appendix 4 – Original prescribing 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. 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.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Section two: Submission details .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Section three: Additional documentation .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	De Montfort University
<b>Programme title</b>	Prescribing for Healthcare Professionals (M Level)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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 template (Appendix 7)
  - SETs Mapping 13.09.12 (Appendix 8)
  - SETs Mapping 22.03.11 (Appendix 9)

### **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.

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

**Reason:** The SETs mapping document attached to the HCPC Annual monitoring audit form refers to changes to resources brought about by the move of campus from the Charles Frears Campus to the City Campus in the academic year 2011-12. Under the section where this evidence can be found, the visitors were referred to a previous major change mapping document, which then refers to various appendices which were not submitted with the documentation for this audit. The visitors were therefore unable to ensure that the resources to support students' learning in all settings are being effectively used.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors would need to see evidence to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met. Evidence provided could be the documents listed in Appendix 9 (Major Change Standards of Education and Training Mapping Template) that was not submitted within this audit, namely Appendix 1 – Plans for Bosworth House, Appendix 2 – Classrooms and lecture theatres at the City campus, Appendix 3 – Resources additional information and Appendix 4 – Original prescribing curriculum.

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

**Reason:** The SETs mapping document attached to the HCPC Annual monitoring audit form refers to changes to resources brought about by the move of campus from the Charles Frears Campus to the City Campus in the academic year 2011-12. Under the section where this evidence can be found, the visitors were referred to a previous major change mapping document, which then refers to various appendices which were not submitted with the documentation for this audit. The visitors were therefore unable to ensure that adequate resources are available to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors would need to see evidence to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met. Evidence provided could be the documents listed in Appendix 9 (Major Change Standards of Education and Training Mapping Template) that was not submitted within this audit, namely Appendix 1 – Plans for Bosworth House, Appendix 2 – Classrooms and lecture theatres at the City campus, Appendix 3 – Resources additional information and Appendix 4 – Original prescribing curriculum.

### **3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.**

**Reason:** The SETs mapping document attached to the HCPC Annual monitoring audit form refers to changes to resources brought about by the move of campus from the Charles Frears Campus to the City Campus in the academic year 2011-12. Under the section where this evidence can be found, the visitors were referred to a previous major change mapping document, which then refers to various appendices which were not submitted with the documentation for this audit. The visitors were unable to be sure if the learning resources are appropriate to the curriculum and available for both students and staff.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors would need to see evidence to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met. Evidence provided could be the documents listed in Appendix 9 (Major Change Standards of Education and Training Mapping Template) that was not submitted within this audit, namely Appendix 1 – Plans for Bosworth House, Appendix 2 – Classrooms and lecture theatres at the City campus, Appendix 3 – Resources additional information and Appendix 4 – Original prescribing 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. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Institute of Biomedical Science
<b>Programme title</b>	Certificate of Competence (Degree followed by Registration Training Portfolio)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Flexible
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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

- Criteria and Guidelines for accreditation of undergraduate degrees
- Registration portfolio
- Standards for Approval of a laboratories for training
- Guidelines for management of training

- Guidelines for external Verifications
- IBMS complaints procedure
- IBMS equal opportunities procedure
- Education & Professional Standards Committee Terms of Reference
- SOP for training laboratory approvals
- Job descriptions for senior IBMS education staff
- Example verifier reports and lab feedback 2011 and 2012
- Example HEI monitoring reports
- Example re-accreditation reports
- Example verifier feedback forms

### **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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Institute of Biomedical Science
<b>Programme title</b>	Certificate of Competence (Degree containing the Registration Training Portfolio)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Flexible
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
- Criteria and Guidelines for accreditation of undergraduate degrees
  - Registration portfolio
  - Standards for Approval of a laboratory for training

- Guidelines for management of training
- Guidelines for external Verifications
- IBMS complaints procedure
- IBMS equal opportunities procedure
- Education & Professional Standards Committee Terms of Reference
- SOP for training laboratory approvals
- Job descriptions for senior IBMS education staff
- Example verifier reports and lab feedback 2011 and 2012
- Example HEI monitoring reports
- Example re-accreditation reports
- Example verifier feedback forms

### **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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Institute of Biomedical Science
<b>Programme title</b>	Certificate of Competence (Non-accredited degree followed by Registration Training Portfolio)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Flexible
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
- Criteria and Guidelines for accreditation of undergraduate degrees
  - Registration portfolio
  - Standards for Approval of a laboratory for training



- Guidelines for management of training
- Guidelines for external Verifications
- IBMS complaints procedure
- IBMS equal opportunities procedure
- Education & Professional Standards Committee Terms of Reference
- SOP for training laboratory approvals
- Job descriptions for senior IBMS education staff
- Example verifier reports and lab feedback 2011 and 2012
- Example HEI monitoring reports
- Example re-accreditation reports
- Example verifier feedback forms

### **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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Keele University & Staffordshire University
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	King's College London
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Allan Winthrop (Counselling psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Jamie Hunt
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

The education provider submitted further documentation:

- Admissions documentation
- Information about practice placements, including audit tools
- Student handbooks

- Further programme information for current staff and students
- Stakeholder meeting information
- 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.

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

The visitors noted, from the documentation provided, that the number of students on the programme increased for the September 2012 intake. Although there is information regarding the increase in the number of students in several of the documents, the visitors were unsure of how the education provider will manage their resources considering the redistribution of student numbers across the physiotherapy provision at the education provider. Therefore the visitors require further information about how the education provider will utilise their resources to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence of how the programme effectively manages the available resources following the increase in the number of students taking 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Manchester Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Alison Bruce (Orthoptist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Amal Hussein
<b>Date of assessment</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Newcastle University
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Language Pathology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Jeanette Seaman (Speech and language therapist) Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - 2012/13 Programme Specifications
  - 2012/13 Programme Regulations
  - SLS General handbook



- MSc Language Pathology Degree Programme Handbooks
- Fitness to Practice Procedure
- Rough Guides to Clinical Education
- Internal Subject Review (ISR) 2008 Final Report
- SLS Generic 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.

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Newcastle University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Sciences
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Jeanette Seaman (Speech and language therapist) Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - SLS Generic handbook
  - Stage 1, 2, 3 & 4 Handbooks

- Fitness to Practice Procedure
- ISR Report
- Stage 2,3 and 4 Rough Guide to Clinical Education
- Degree Programme Specifications
- Degree Programme Regulations

### **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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Oxford Brookes University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Pauline Etkin (Music therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Oxford Brookes University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Alison Bruce (Orthoptist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Amal Hussein
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Access to Moodle (extract from handbook) Revised programme specification Revised module descriptions
  - Audit/ profile of Italian (Erasmus exchange) placements
  - Minor change form ref change of assessment

- Module Handbook for U42926 demonstrating assessment changes :  
Preparation for 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.

### **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 that the comprehensive nature and the volume of the documentation meant that the submission was not entirely conducive to for the visitors to come to their decision. The submission contained a great deal of university procedural documentation which made it difficult to identify where any changes were made to the programme. The visitors suggest that the education provider only provides documentation beyond the documents required that clearly support any changes to the way in which the programme meets the standards of education and training.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Oxford Brookes University
<b>Programme title</b>	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Oxford Brookes University
<b>Programme title</b>	FdSc Paramedic Emergency Care
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time Mixed mode
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Curriculum vitae for subject coordinator
  - Virtual Learning Environment change from Blackboard - Moodle

### **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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Nottingham
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-medical Prescribing (v300) (Level 6)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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: Access to Moodle (extract from handbook)
  - Appendix 2: Revised module description

### **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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Oxford Brookes University
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-medical Prescribing (v300) (PG Level)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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: Access to Moodle (extract from handbook)
  - Appendix 2: Revised module description

### **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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	St George's, University of London
<b>Name of awarding / validating body</b>	University of London
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Amal Hussein
<b>Date of assessment</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bedfordshire
<b>Programme title</b>	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University Campus Suffolk
<b>Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)</b>	Universities of East Anglia and Essex
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer) Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Tracey Samuel-Smith
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

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

The visitors were satisfied that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training. They would recommend when submitting future annual monitoring submissions and when no changes have been made, that this is clearly identified against each standard of education and training within the mapping document.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Birmingham
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full Time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Amal Hussein
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Basic life support information letter
  - Curriculum Vitae of Grahame Pope

### **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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bradford
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Personnel Changes 2013 document.
  - Statistics and Key Performance Indicators for 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.

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bradford
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Amal Hussein
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that there has been a reduction of staff dedicated to the delivery of the programme. The visitors also noted that this loss in staff has been mitigated by existing staff subsuming the additional work into their own workload. However, the visitors could not determine from the evidence provided, what the process of managing this increased workload for existing members of staff has been. Therefore, to ensure that the programme still has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place the visitors require further evidence.

**Suggested documentation:** Further evidence of how the programme team have managed the increased workload for current staff members to mitigate the loss of staff dedicated to programme delivery.

### 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 five: Visitors' comments .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bradford
<b>Programme title</b>	Prescribing for Health Care Professionals
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Gordon Burrows (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Allied Health Professionals Competency Framework
  - 'Prescribing for health care professionals' – mock examination
  - Email from external examiner

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

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

### **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 the School of Health Studies 'Prescribing for Health Care Professionals' mock examination, and also noted the change to the assessment of this module from a 1 hour multiple choice paper to a 1 hour multiple choice paper and short answer paper. Although the visitors were satisfied that the standards of education and training continue to be met, the content of the multiple choice questions included some questions that could be out of the scope of practice of an allied health professional supplementary prescriber.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Brighton
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Sarah Johnson (Occupational therapist) Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Nicola Baker
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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 descriptors
  - Placement assessment 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.

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Brighton
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Brighton
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Amal Hussein
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Personal, Academic Tutoring 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.

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Brighton
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Chiropodist / podiatrist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Gordon Burrows (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Brighton
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Rehabilitation Science (Physiotherapist) (formally MSc Rehabilitation Science)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Amal Hussein
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Academic development committee course title proposal.
  - PgDip/MSc in Rehabilitation Science student handbook
  - 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.

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Brighton
<b>Programme title</b>	Clinical Pharmacology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Prescription only medicine
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - 2013 Independent and Supplementary Prescribing Modules Information Literature
  - 2013 Application form for Allied health professionals
  - Annual Monitoring Report 2010 – 2011



- Annual Monitoring Report 2011 – 2012

### **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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Brighton
<b>Programme title</b>	PG Dip Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Sarah Johnson (Occupational therapist) Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Nicola Baker
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Course and practice placement handbook
  - General examination and assessment regulations
  - Academic 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.

#### **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 provided, the visitors identified that the programme lead changed from Heidi von Kurthy to Lee Price in 2010. This may affect the way in which SET 3.4 is met. This will therefore require further scrutiny in order to ensure that Lee Price has the appropriate qualifications and experience required and is adequately supported.

**Suggested documentation:** The evidence to demonstrate this change could be the curriculum vitae of the new programme leader.

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted from the SETs mapping submitted, that modules HEM 53 and HEM 61 were referenced to cover the HCPC's Standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors noted from the handbook for 2012 – 14, that HEM 61 contains references to 'HPC ...standards of practice'. However they were unable to find specific references to the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics in any of the modules. The visitors therefore did not see sufficient evidence that these are being addressed in the curriculum. They also noted that the information to students has not been updated to reflect the current setting of regulation for occupational therapists and that many references to guidance documents are inaccurate.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors must see evidence that the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are specifically addressed in the curriculum, and that the information available to students provides adequate and accurate guidance to the relevant documents.

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Brighton
<b>Programme title</b>	PG Dip Rehabilitation Science (Physiotherapist) (formally PG Dip Rehabilitation Science)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Amal Hussein
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Academic development committee course title proposal.
  - PgDip/MSc in Rehabilitation Science student handbook
  - 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.

### **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 five: Visitors' comments .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bristol
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Audiology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Hearing aid dispenser
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

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

The visitors wished to point out that the education provider has made references to a BSc Audiology programme which is not approved by HCPC. Therefore, the visitors suggest that the education provider should revisit the programme documentation and provide correct reference to the approved BSc (Hons) Audiology programme.



## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of East London
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Amal Hussein
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of East London
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Situating Learning)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Amal Hussein
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of East London
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Podiatric Medicine
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Chiropodist / podiatrist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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

### **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.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Exeter
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
- Key Performance Indicators / Sampling Plan / Contract Management Meeting notes
  - Entry Agreement – Self Assessment document

- Curriculum Vitae
- Reflective Organisational Practice powerpoint presentation
- Selection Feedback meeting minutes/candidate feedback 2012
- My PGR

### **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.

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

The visitors in their reading of the documentation were interested in the My PGR, the student management system for recording meetings between trainees, supervisors and mentors. It allows arrangement of meetings, writing them up and being signed off by more than one supervisor. The system specifies the minimum number of meetings in an academic year, and allows documents to be uploaded and useful information about a trainee from the student records system to be reviewed. The visitors considered that it would be beneficial in future audits to provide feedback from all parties on whether My PGR is a useful tool.



## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Hertfordshire
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Therapeutic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
- Placement Learning Handbook 2012-13 part 1 and part 2 (supplementary 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.

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Hertfordshire
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Hertfordshire
<b>Programme title</b>	MA Art Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Arts therapist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Art therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist) Sarah Johnson (Occupational therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Nicola Baker
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Curriculum vitae for external examiner

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

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

### **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 five: Visitors' comments .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Hertfordshire
<b>Programme title</b>	Practice Certificate in Non Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Gordon Burrows (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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 3: Admissions process flowchart and supplementary Admissions form
  - Appendix 4: UH strategic plan

- Appendix 5: Programme Committee Minutes January 2013
- Appendix 6: NMPx Programme Handbook
- Appendix 7: Statement re: UH learning resources
- Appendix 8: Faculty placement complaints policy
- Appendix 9: Consent form re involvement in diagnostic skills session
- Appendix 10: Fitness to practise policy
- Appendix 11: Lecture notes and guided study activities
- Appendix 12: Practice Portfolio
- Appendix 13: DMP 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.

### **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 SET 3.1 continues to be met. However, they would like to remind the education provider that if there are any changes to the business plan that is currently being developed for the new 'School of Health and Social Work' that impacts upon the way in which the programme meets SET 3.1, the HCPC should be informed through the major change process.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Huddersfield
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Sarah Johnson (Occupational therapist) Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Nicola Baker
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Huddersfield
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Alison Bruce (Orthoptist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Amal Hussein
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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 skills 1 and 2
  - Module specification (Clinical reasoning)
  - Curriculum vitae of Martin Assame
  - Curriculum vitae of Phyl Fletcher- Cook

### **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.

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

Despite the comprehensive level of material on the education provider's website, the visitors were unable to locate the relevant information as to who the new programme leader is for the programme. Although the visitors agreed that the standards of education and training are met, the visitors would like to remind the education provider to update their BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy website page to reflect the new programme leader.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Huddersfield
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Chiropodist / podiatrist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Huddersfield
<b>Programme title</b>	Clinical Pharmacology for Podiatrists
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Prescription only medicine
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Hull
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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 Misconduct/Unsuitability policy – Faculty of Health
  - Joint Disciplinary Procedure – University of Hull / Humber NHS Foundation Trust

- Joint Disciplinary Procedure (flow chart) – University of Hull / Humber NHS Foundation 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.

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Huddersfield
<b>Programme title</b>	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Leeds
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer) Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Tracey Samuel-Smith
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Lecture materials relating to SET 5.4

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

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

### **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 that the HCPC records the programme as BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic) while within the documentation submitted by the education provider, the programme is recorded as BSc (Hons) Radiography. The visitors recommend that the title of the programme is clarified to ensure the correct programme title appears on the register of approved programmes on the HCPC website.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Lincoln
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer) Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Tracey Samuel-Smith
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Liverpool
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer) Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Tracey Samuel-Smith
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Liverpool
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Orthoptics
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Orthoptist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Alison Bruce (Orthoptist) Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Amal Hussein
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Liverpool
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Pauline Etkin (Music therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Liverpool
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Alison Bruce (Orthoptist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Amal Hussein
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

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

The visitors noted the periodic review of 'The School of Health Science' which took place on '5-7/03/12'. The visitors agreed that the standards of education and training continue to be met. To ensure the standards continue to be met however, the visitors would like to remind the education provide to address the issue of facilities that was mentioned in the report under the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy section.

The visitors request in future that the education provider submit all relevant external examiner reports. Similarly, for accuracy and ease of understanding for future audit submissions, the visitors suggest that the education provider is explicit about the author of each external examiner report.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Liverpool
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Therapeutic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) 9 April 2013
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Periodic review March 2012 and action place

### **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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Liverpool
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin.Psychol)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Stephen Davies (Clinical psychologist) Judith Bamford (Educational psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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 internal quality report for one year ago was not submitted because the education providers' annual review meeting for that year did not meet.

- Academic Handbook (2012-2013)
- Assessment Handbook (2012-2013)
- Clinical Handbook (2012-2013)
- General Handbook (2012-2013)
- Research Handbook (2012-2013)

### **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.

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the mapping document provided by the education provider that the annual review meeting has not been able to be convened in 2011 or 2012. As such the visitors require further information to demonstrate how the programme has ensured that the quality monitoring of the programme has been maintained, in the absence of an annual review meeting in 2011 or 2012. This further evidence is required so that the visitors can be assured that the programme has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence of how the programme ensures that the quality monitoring of the programme has been maintained.

#### **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 mapping document (SET 3.5) that there have been recent changes to the structure of the programme's management and administrative teams following a "difficult period in terms of administrative support". The education provider also states that several other changes in staffing have taken place since the time of the approval visit. The mapping document refers to page 4 of the general handbook, which provides a list of staff but does not specify what interim arrangements are in place following the departure of Dr Ian Fletcher in May 2012 and the changes in staffing. The visitors require further evidence regarding the staffing changes to ensure that the programme has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information about the staffing changes and the arrangements put in place to mitigate against these 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. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Manchester
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer) Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Tracey Samuel-Smith
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Strategic plan for Faculty of Medical and Human Sciences
  - Staff curriculum vitae's

- Practice placement documentation
- Documentation relating to the professional body accreditation

### **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.



## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Nottingham
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Alison Bruce (Orthoptist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Amal Hussein
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Course Handbook, September 2012

### **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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Nottingham
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer) Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Tracey Samuel-Smith
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Salford
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Amal Hussein
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Mapping of learning outcomes to the QAA and FHEQ
  - Programme specification
  - Manger and PEF minutes

- Introduction to collaborative professional practice module specification
- Into employment module specification
- Student portfolio
- Evaluating health promotion within Physiotherapy module specification
- Practice-based learning module specification
- Assessment and Management Peripheral 1& 2
- Neurological assessment & management module specification
- Exercise across the lifespan module specification
- Management and assessment strategies in challenging situations (MASCs)
- Research in Physiotherapy Practice module specification
- Fundamentals of exercise & conditioning module specification
- Cardiovascular and Respiratory Assessment and Management (CRAM)
- Practice Based Learning 1, 2, 3 & 4 module specification
- Spinal assessment & management module specification
- Visiting Lecturer Evaluation of Clinical Educator/Experience
- Clinical Placement Contact Form
- Student Evaluation of Visiting Lecturer & clinical educators
- Table of assessment
- Academic regulations
- Assessment and feedback for taught awards document
- Programme handbooks
- Cardiovascular and Respiratory Assessment and Management
- Fundamentals of Exercise and Conditioning: Delivery and assessment strategy
- Programme Design, Approval, Amendment, Review and Withdrawal
- Academic Appeals 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.

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

The visitors wished to point out that the comprehensive nature and the volume of the documentation meant that the submission was not entirely conducive to come to their decision. Annual monitoring is a retrospective process focusing on changes not previously approved by the HCPC. The visitors noted that the submission contained a great deal of university procedural documentation which made it difficult to identify where, if any, changes were made to the programme. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that documentation seen as part of a previous approval or monitoring process does not need to be submitted again through the annual monitoring process. The visitors would therefore like to highlight to the education provider that the volume of documentation submitted is unnecessary. Such volume may require greater effort from the education provider and is not necessary for any future HCPC annual monitoring audit.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme title</b>	Access and Supply Pharmacology (A and S POMs)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Prescription only medicine
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

The education provider has not submitted any external examiner reports or responses to the external examiner report as the programme is not currently running and has not run since 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.

### **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**

Whilst the visitors were satisfied that the standards of education and training (SETs) continue to be met, they would like to remind the education provider that when the programme starts to run again, if there are any changes that may impact upon the SETs, to inform the HCPC via the major change process.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Educational Psychology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Educational psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Stephen Davies (Clinical psychologist) Judith Bamford (Educational psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Advisory Group minutes
  - Staff resources
  - Fitness to practise policy

- Committee structure diagram

### **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.

### **3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.**

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the Doctorate in Educational Psychology Programme Board minutes (Friday 19 October 2012 – item 4) that the education provider has recently had a number of issues with the administrative aspect of the management of the programme, following the centralisation of the administrative system. The SETs mapping document refers to a change in accountability from the school education committee to the academic unit programme board, but does not mention the centralisation of the administrative system, and the implications of this across the programme. In order to be assured that the programme continues to be effectively managed, the visitors require evidence of the change highlighted in the SETs mapping document (SET 3.2). The also require further information about how the administrative issues outlined in the Doctorate in Educational Psychology Programme Board minutes (19 October 2012 – Item 4) and also in the Year 1 programme board report (October 2012) are being addressed.

**Suggested documentation:** Information regarding the change highlighted in the SETs mapping document (SET 3.2) and information about how the administrative issues are being addressed.

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme title</b>	Independent and supplementary Prescribing: Prescribing in practice – Allied Health Professions
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlements</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Chiropodist / podiatrist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Curriculum vitae for Ivan Bristow (Lecturer)
  - Minutes from the Curriculum Approval Committee (September 2012)
  - Rationale for losing IPLU3 from the AHP curricula in 2012/13
  - 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.

### **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 the documentation that it appears that this programme is not currently running. They would like to remind the education provider that when the programme starts to run again, if there are any changes to the programme that may impact the SETs, to inform the HCPC via the major change process.



## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme title</b>	Pg Dip Podiatry (Pre-registration)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Chiropodist / podiatrist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Curriculum vitae for Ivan Bristow (Lecturer)
  - Minutes from the Curriculum Approval Committee (September 2012)
  - Rationale for losing IPLU3 from the AHP curricula in 2012/13
  - 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.

### **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 the documentation that it appears that this programme is not currently running. They would like to remind the education provider that when the programme starts to run again, if there are any changes to the programme that may impact the SETs, to inform the HCPC via the major change process.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Sunderland
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Kathyrn Thirlaway (Health psychologist) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Surrey
<b>Programme title</b>	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Surrey
<b>Programme title</b>	Health Psychology (PhD) and PG Cert in Health Psychology Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Health psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Kathryn Thirlaway (Health psychologist) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.



## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of the West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Clinical)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Block release
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Kathyrn Thirlaway (Health psychologist) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer) Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Tracey Samuel-Smith
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

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

Following discussions with the executive, the visitors noted that the documentation submitted for the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging and the Graduate Diploma Diagnostic Imaging programmes was the same. The visitors were unable to identify this from the documentation and felt it would be helpful for future submissions if the link between the two programmes was clearly identified within the submission.

.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of the West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Pauline Etkin (Music therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

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

The visitors noted the documentation submitted for the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and the Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy programmes was the same. Initially, the visitors were unable to identify that the documentation submitted was the same for both programmes. The visitors suggest that the education provider should clearly distinguish between the two programmes when submitting documents in the future.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of the West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) Jeanette Seaman (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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
  - Details of major changes submitted to HCPC which were deferred to annual monitoring process.
    - Module changes

- External examiner change
- Module specification for Contemporary Physiotherapy 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.

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

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

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

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



## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of the West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Therapeutic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme title</b>	Graduate Diploma Diagnostic Imaging
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer) Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Tracey Samuel-Smith
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

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

Following discussions with the executive, the visitors noted that the documentation submitted for the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging and the Graduate Diploma Diagnostic Imaging programmes was the same. The visitors were unable to identify this from the documentation and felt it would be helpful for future submissions if the link between the two programmes was clearly identified within the submission.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of the West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme title</b>	Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Pauline Etkin (Music therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

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

The visitors noted that the documentation submitted for the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and the Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy programmes was the same. Initially, the visitors were unable to identify that the documentation submitted was the same for both programmes. The visitors suggest that the education provider should clearly distinguish between the two programmes when submitting documents in the future.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of the West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme title</b>	Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) Jeanette Seaman (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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 Graduate Diploma programme has not run and as such internal quality documentation does not exist.

- Details of major changes submitted to HCPC which were deferred to annual monitoring process.
  - Module changes
  - External examiner change
- Module specification for Contemporary Physiotherapy 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.

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

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

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

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



## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of the West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme title</b>	MA Music Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Arts therapist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Music therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Pauline Etkin (Music therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of the West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Radiotherapy & Oncology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Therapeutic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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 report UZYSHM20-M
  - Module report UZYSHL-20-M
  - Erica White external examiner's 2011-12-report

This programme has only run for one academic year. Therefore there is only one year's annual monitoring documentation provided for this audit.

### **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.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of the West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme title</b>	Post Graduate Diploma in Health Psychology (Professional Practice)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Health psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Kathryn Thirlaway (Health psychologist) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

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

The visitors noted in the documentation submitted that one member of staff started in September 2012, is on a one year secondment contract. The visitors wished to point out that the education provider should monitor the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective 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 five: Visitors' comments .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of the West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme title</b>	Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Health psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Kathryn Thirlaway (Health psychologist) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

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

The visitors noted in the documentation submitted that one member of staff started in September 2012, is on a one year secondment contract. The visitors wished to point out that the education provider should monitor the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective 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 five: Visitors' comments .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of West London
<b>Programme title</b>	DipHE Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC 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.

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

The visitors wished to point out that the education provider should clearly specify the approved programme being the only programme which contains any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award. The visitors noted in the documentation submitted and on the education provider's website that the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme provides eligibility for registration with HCPC as an Operating department practitioner. This is an incorrect statement as this programme is not approved by HCPC. The visitors suggest that the education provider should inform HCPC about their BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme, if they intend it to confer eligibility to register, by submitting a major change request form.