

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Birmingham City University
Programme title	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Ruth Baker (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Service User and Carer involvement documentation

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

Name of education provider	Birmingham City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Graham Noyce (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Service user and carer involvement 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

Name of education provider	Birmingham City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
 - Service user and carer narrative documents

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

Name of education provider	University of Bedfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Lincoln Simmons (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
 - BSc (Hons) ODP Benchmark mapping
 - Course handbook
 - ODP skills register for 2017-18 academic year
 - ODP programme team CV's
 - Practice handbook

The required documentation has not been submitted as the programme has not commenced since it was approved in June 2015.

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

Name of education provider	University of Bedfordshire
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	27 February 2017

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors from their reading could not see any direct evidence of the how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The education provider said in the audit document that Service users are regularly invited to attend interviews and assessments. The programme team regularly engage with service users to maintain strong links with the university. The visitors could not see where and how service users are involved in this programme and if there is any training and development for the service users and carers. Therefore the visitors require evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in 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 five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Birmingham
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Simon Dykes (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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 stated that: "The response to the external examiners' report for last year has not been submitted as the University are still unclear about whether the report should have been submitted due to an extension on the External's term of office being granted to cover the running out of the old programme, which had a January start. Our new programme has moved to a September start and the new External has started her term to cover the new programme only, with her next report due summer 2017."

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 from the start of the 2016-17 academic year the programme had increased student numbers from 26 to 48, and that the HCPC did not appear to have been informed of this change. Although the 2016-17 academic year falls outside the scope of this process, the visitors considered that this increase in student numbers could affect the programme's ability to meet a number of the standards of education and training. They therefore recommend that the HCPC should contact the education provider to clarify the situation, with a view to looking at the change in student numbers via the major change or approval processes.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Bournemouth University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Tracey Clephan (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
 - Physiotherapy admissions process
 - Integration of service users and carers document
 - Physiotherapy statistics
 - Student representative reports
 - Grow@BU report
 - Programme management team meeting minutes

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

Name of education provider	Bournemouth University
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	27 February 2017

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors in their reading could not see any direct evidence of the how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The education provider said in the audit document that Service users had involvement in IPE themed days including Dementia, Humanising Care. They were involved in the review of assessment paperwork on 6 C's, part of next interviewing panels and this is demonstrated in 6 C's – 1st and 2nd year practice profiles. Unfortunately the practice portfolio information was not provided for review. Therefore the visitors could not see where and how service users are involved in this programme and if there is any training and development for the service users and carers. The visitors require evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme as identified in the audit document.

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 agreed that the standard for service users and carers is met. However they would like the education provider to consider how they could enhance the involvement of service users and carers within the programme. In this way the programme team can ensure that they continue to involve service users and carers and that there is a lower risk of the programme not being able to meet this standard in the future, should any changes happen.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	BA Honours in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social Work
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Dicken (Social worker in England) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - Equality and diversity strategy
 - BA Social Work programme handbook
 - Organisational diagram
 - Programme management board minutes
 - HCPC registration evidence
 - Curriculum vitae for new staff
 - Student staff liaison committee minutes
 - Library resource link

- Academic skills advice link
- Rebus reading list link
- BA Practice learning handbook 2015-2016
- Student consent form
- Fitness-to-practice-procedures
- Module handbooks
- Service user and carer forum group minutes
- Module Handbooks
- CPD file guidance document
- Readiness process structure
- Programme Specification 2015-16
- Practice Learning 1 and 2 assessment guidance
- SOW6004-D Practice Learning II 201617- module descriptor
- Readiness for practice workshops
- BA Social Care programme 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 content that the standards of education and training are met through the audit process. However the visitors noted that there had been several changes to the management of the programme as well as changes to various education provider

processes. The visitors would advise that the education provider engages with the HCPC major change process in future, so that any significant changes made to the programme can be reviewed appropriately.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social Work
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Dicken (Social worker in England) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - Practice learning handbook
 - Readiness for practice workshops
 - Readiness for practice timetable
 - MA and BA Continuous professional development guidance handbook document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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 content that the standards of education and training are met through the audit process. However the visitors noted that there had been several changes to the management of the programme as well as changes to various education provider processes. The visitors would advise that the education provider engages with the HCPC major change process in future, so that any significant changes made to the programme can be reviewed appropriately.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma Mental Health Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Lynda Kelly (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - Practice Module Handbook
 - Module Descriptors
 - Employer Agreement
 - 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Supplementary prescriber) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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
 - Sample timetable
 - Competency document

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider had not submitted the internal quality report for one year ago as the report is not yet available for the public domain. The visitors note that without this document they cannot consider how the programme has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place. The visitors remind the education provider that the HCPC will not publish their report in the public domain and as a regulatory body, the HCPC require the internal quality report as part of the annual monitoring audit. Therefore the visitors require the internal quality report from one year ago in order to determine whether the programme has had regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Suggested documentation: The internal quality report from one year ago.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	Prescribing for Healthcare Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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
- Sample timetable
- Competency document

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider had not submitted the internal quality report for one year ago as the report is not yet available for the public domain. The visitors note that without this document they cannot consider how the programme has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place. The visitors remind the education provider that the HCPC will not publish their report in the public domain and as a regulatory body, the HCPC require the internal quality report as part of the annual monitoring audit. Therefore the visitors require the internal quality report from one year ago in order to determine whether the programme has had regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Suggested documentation: The internal quality report from one year ago.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Bristol
Programme title	Doctorate of Educational Psychology (D.Ed.Psy.)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist) Tony Ward (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date postal review	21 February 2017

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
 - Research Commission Handbook
 - Overview of teaching sessions for 'Understanding and Challenging Social Barriers

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

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.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Section two: Submission details	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Section three: Additional documentation	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Section five: Visitors' comments	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Bristol
Programme title	MSc in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Michael Branicki (Social worker in England) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
- Minutes of service user and carer forum

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 provided for this audit that there was a proposed increase in student numbers for the programme for the 2016 entry cohort. The HCPC currently approves a cohort of 50 and the proposed intake was 57. The visitors wish to remind the education provider that they should engage with the HCPC major change process if this the increase in student numbers impacts on the resources for the programme including staffing and other resources such as practice placements.

The visitors would also remind the education provider that they should use the correct audit monitoring mapping form to ensure that the mapping of documents can be easily found by the visitors.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Bristol
Programme title	Post-Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Michael Branicki (Social worker in England) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
- Minutes of service user and carer forum

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 provided for this audit that there was a proposed increase in student numbers for the programme for the 2016 entry cohort. The HCPC currently approves a cohort of 50 and the proposed intake was 57. The visitors wish to remind the education provider that they should engage with the HCPC major change process if this the increase in student numbers impacts on the resources for the programme including staffing and other resources such as practice placements.

The visitors would also remind the education provider that they should use the correct audit monitoring mapping form to ensure that the mapping of documents can be easily found by the visitors.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Lincoln Simmons (Clinical psychologist) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
 - University and NHS trust contract management meeting minutes
 - University and NHS trust contract management key performance indicators
 - Report on service user and carer involvement
 - Quality assurance reports on practice placements

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

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme title	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Blythe (Social worker in England) Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	2 May 2017

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
- PgD / MA Social Work Programme Specification
- MA Social Work Student Programme Handbook
- BSc (Hons) / PgD / MA Social Work Practice Portfolio

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

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Blythe (Social worker in England) Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	2 May 2017

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
- PgD / MA Social Work Programme Specification
- MA Social Work Student Programme Handbook
- BSc (Hons) / PgD / MA Social Work Practice Portfolio

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

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Name of validating body	Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich
Programme title	Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist) Dawn Blenkin (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Validation document 2012
 - Service user forum minutes
 - Module modification 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 five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Chester
Programme title	MA Applied Mental Health Practice
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Lynda Kelly (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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 supplied internal quality reports for 2013-14 and 2014-15, but not for 2015-16

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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes 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 internal quality report for 2014-15, that the education provider is planning a "Review of accommodation for AMHP training delivery" with a "New location for Jan 2017". Although this change is outside of the current audit period, the visitors considered that a change in facilities would constitute a major change to the delivery of the programme and the facilities available for students. Therefore, the visitors note that the education provider should submit a major change notification form to the HCPC detailing how this change impacts on the AMHP criteria.

The visitors also noted that the education provider provided their internal quality reports from 2013-14 and 2014-15, but not for the 2015-16 academic year. The visitors were able to make the judgement that the programme continued to meet the AMHP criteria with the other information provided, but wanted to note that the education provider should ensure they provide all correct documentation in future audits.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Chester
Programme title	PG Diploma Applied Mental Health Practice
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Lynda Kelly (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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 supplied internal quality reports for 2013-14 and 2014-15, but not for 2015-16

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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes 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 internal quality report for 2014-15, that the education provider is planning a "Review of accommodation for AMHP training delivery" with a "New location for Jan 2017". Although this change is outside of the current audit period, the visitors considered that a change in facilities would constitute a major change to the delivery of the programme and the facilities available for students. Therefore, the visitors note that the education provider should submit a major change notification form to the HCPC detailing how this change impacts on the AMHP criteria.

The visitors also noted that the education provider provided their internal quality reports from 2013-14 and 2014-15, but not for the 2015-16 academic year. The visitors were able to make the judgement that the programme continued to meet the AMHP criteria with the other information provided, but wanted to note that the education provider should ensure they provide all correct documentation in future audits.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Chester
Programme title	PG Cert Applied Mental Health Practice
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Lynda Kelly (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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 supplied internal quality reports for 2013-14 and 2014-15, but not for 2015-16

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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes 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 internal quality report for 2014-15, that the education provider is planning a "Review of accommodation for AMHP training delivery" with a "New location for Jan 2017". Although this change is outside of the current audit period, the visitors considered that a change in facilities would constitute a major change to the delivery of the programme and the facilities available for students. Therefore, the visitors note that the education provider should submit a major change notification form to the HCPC detailing how this change impacts on the AMHP criteria.

The visitors also noted that the education provider provided their internal quality reports from 2013-14 and 2014-15, but not for the 2015-16 academic year. The visitors were able to make the judgement that the programme continued to meet the AMHP criteria with the other information provided, but wanted to note that the education provider should ensure they provide all correct documentation in future audits.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	Dip HE Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser) John Donaghy (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) in Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	27 February 2017

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
- University admissions policy and applicants complaint Procedure 2016
- Course selection event letter
- Clinical placement information form
- University academic regulations 2016
- A staff guide to APL: An overview of APL for UCLan Staff 2015
- University equality, diversity and inclusion strategy 2016 – 2020
- University academic quality assurance manual taught courses 2016
- Module leader report NU3043

- Curriculum vitae Lynne Harrison
- Module feedback questionnaire
- Guidance for academic advisors 2015-16
- University student complaints procedure 2016
- Agenda staff student liaison meeting
- University regulation for the conduct of students 2016
- University fitness to practice procedure 2016
- University open day programme 2016
- NU1051 timetable
- NU1021 OSCE marking sheet station 1
- Course developers guide appendix 20
- University assessment handbook 2016
- Module descriptor NU1050
- Module descriptor NU3044

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors in their reading could not see any direct evidence of the how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The education provider provided weblinks to COMENSUS, the service user and carer site for the education provider. Whilst the visitors could see further involvement within the education provider there were no direct links to the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme. The visitors were also sign posted to module descriptors, and the OSCE mark sheet. Again they visitors could not see any support or development of service users in these documents. The visitors could not see how the service users and carers are supported in their involvement in the programme. Therefore the visitors require evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme and what training they receive to support this involvement in the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dawn Blenkin (Occupational therapist) Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Fitness to practice policy
 - Academic regulations
 - Personal tutor policy
 - Professional practice case conference terms of reference
 - PPI expenses and payments policy
 - PPI market flyer
 - PPI steering group membership and terms of reference
 - PPI staff guidelines

- PPI values statement
- Process PARE evaluation tool
- PARE evaluation tool webpage

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

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Simon Dykes (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
 - Jayne Coleman Curriculum vitae
 - Ann Noblett Curriculum vitae
 - Fitness to Practise Policy 2016
 - EE Janette Grey Curriculum vitae
 - Personal Tutoring Policy
 - Professional Practice Case Conference Terms of Reference (ToR)
 - PPI Expenses and Payments Policy
 - PPI Marketing Flyer
 - PPI Steering Group Membership and ToR

- PPI Staff Guidelines 2017
- PPI Values Statement 2017
- Process - PARE Evaluation Tool
- PARE Evaluation Tool webpage

The missing documents are missing because the programme only resumed recruitment in 2015-16 after a three-year hiatus.

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the material concerning service user and carer involvement, and are unclear about what involvement service users and carers had with the programme, including how service users and carers had been appropriately trained and how input from service user and carers had been fed into the programme. They noted that in the Programme Annual Evaluatory Review (page 6), the education provider say that “this is an area which needs developing...We are currently waiting for direction from the Service User advisory group to develop this input further.” Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of what the programme team have done to determine which service users are most appropriate, and how service users and carers are trained and supported.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to clearly demonstrate how the education provider selected service users and carers for this programme, and how they are trained and prepared.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dawn Blenkin (Occupational therapist) Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Placement handbook
 - Practice educators placement handbook
 - Fitness to practice policy
 - Academic regulations
 - Personal tutor policy
 - Course webpage entry requirements
 - Professional practice case conference terms of reference

- PPI expenses and payments policy
- PPI market flyer
- PPI steering group membership and terms of reference
- PPI staff guidelines
- PPI values statement
- Process PARE evaluation tool
- PARE evaluation tool webpage

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

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Graham Noyce (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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 webpage entry requirements
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Fitness to practise policy
 - Rolling public and patient involvement (PPI) action plan
 - Personal tutoring policy
 - Professional practice case conference

- PPI expenses and payment policy
- PPI marketing flyer
- PPI steering group membership
- PPI staff guidelines
- PPI values statement
- Process PARE (Practice Assessment Record and Evaluation) evaluation tool
- PARE evaluation tool webpage

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 both of the internal monitoring reports (2014-15 and 2015-16) that there have been issues with administrative support on the programme. Specifically, the programme leader has noted in the 2014-15 report that the administration support services are “located remotely from Department and over both campuses and this continues to reduce efficiency and cause problems in some areas.” However, the visitors did not see evidence in the documentation as to how the education provider is addressing this issue. As such, the visitors noted that this could be having an impact on the academic staff being able to deliver an effective programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that the education provider is addressing any issues in relation to administrative support and, therefore, that staff are able to continue to deliver an effective 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 five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Radiographer) Graham Noyce (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Module allocations
- Module guide
- Report on Overview and Feedback from involvement from Experts by Experience
- External examiner profile and nomination form
- Personal tutoring policy
- Admissions procedure
- Fitness to practise policy

- Professional practice case conference
- Public and patient involvement (PPI) expenses and payments policy
- PPI expenses and payment policy
- PPI marketing flyer
- PPI steering group membership and terms of reference
- PPI staff guidelines
- PPI values statement

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 full time route runs at two different campuses and that the education provider has made the decision that one of these campuses will no longer offer the programme. As this is a prospective change, the visitors would like the education provider to consider how this may have an impact on the programme meeting the standards of education and training, particularly in relation to the provision across the BA (Hons) Social Work full time programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Radiographer) Graham Noyce (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Module allocations
 - Module guide
 - Report on Overview and Feedback from involvement from Experts by Experience
 - External examiner profile and nomination form
 - Personal tutoring policy
 - Admissions procedure
 - Fitness to practise policy
 - Professional practice case conference

- Public and patient involvement (PPI) expenses and payments policy
- PPI expenses and payment policy
- PPI marketing flyer
- PPI steering group membership and terms of reference
- PPI staff guidelines
- PPI values statement

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

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma Mental Health Practice
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Lynda Kelly (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - Staff and external examiner CVs
 - Management Structure documents
 - HCPC major change documentations
 - Module descriptors
 - Programme specifications and handbooks
 - Personal Tutoring Policy
 - Fitness to Practise Policy 2016
 - Public and Patient Involvement documentation

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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	PG Dip Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Radiographer) Graham Noyce (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Module allocations
 - Module guide
 - Report on Overview and Feedback from involvement from Experts by Experience
 - External examiner profile and nomination form
 - Personal tutoring policy
 - Admissions procedure
 - Fitness to practise policy
 - Professional practice case conference

- Public and patient involvement (PPI) expenses and payments policy
- PPI expenses and payment policy
- PPI marketing flyer
- PPI steering group membership and terms of reference
- PPI staff guidelines
- PPI values statement

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

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	UAWd Approved Mental Health Practice
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Lynda Kelly (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - Staff and external examiner CVs
 - Management Structure documents
 - HCPC major change documentations
 - Module descriptors
 - Programme specifications and handbooks
 - Personal Tutoring Policy
 - Fitness to Practise Policy 2016
 - Public and Patient Involvement documentation

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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes 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

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Radiographer) Graham Noyce (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
- Staff curriculum vitae
 - Module allocations
 - Module guide
 - Report on Overview and Feedback from involvement from Experts by Experience
 - External examiner profile and nomination form
 - Personal tutoring policy
 - Admissions procedure
 - Fitness to practise policy

- Professional practice case conference
- Public and patient involvement (PPI) expenses and payments policy
- PPI expenses and payment policy
- PPI marketing flyer
- PPI steering group membership and terms of reference
- PPI staff guidelines
- PPI values statement

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 mapping document that the programme was commissioned for two cohorts by Cumbria County Council and will be closing in 2019 once the last cohort has graduated. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that it should formally submit a programme closure form to the HCPC once the closing date is finalised nearer the time.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	MA Mental Health Practice
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Lynda Kelly (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - Staff and external examiner CVs
 - Management Structure documents
 - HCPC major change documentations
 - Module descriptors
 - Programme specifications and handbooks
 - Personal Tutoring Policy
 - Fitness to Practise Policy 2016
 - Public and Patient Involvement documentation

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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	De Montfort University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser) Martin Benwell (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	10 March 2017

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
 - Strategy for Public Patient Involvement (PPI)
 - Patient adviser person specification
 - Patient feedback form
 - 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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted in the mapping document that the education provider will be changing how they involve service users and carers in the programme. The education provider previously met this standard by involving service users in the teaching of modules. From the visitors' understanding from the documents provided, the involvement of service users will be replaced by the "Draft service user strategy" as described in Document 10. The visitors were unclear as to how the new strategy will adequately address the involvement of service users and carers in the programme. As such, the visitors require further evidence of service user and carer involvement in the programme and why this involvement is appropriate for the programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the appropriate service user and carer involvement in 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

Name of education provider	De Montfort University
Programme title	BSc Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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 enhancement plan
- Curriculum vitae of programme staff
- Service user questionnaire
- Programme timetable

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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

D.7 The designated medical practitioner must undertake appropriate training.

Reason: The visitors noted that the designated medical practitioner (DMP) training had poor attendance, and in response the education provider replaced the training session with a factsheet that is sent to all DMPs. Based on the evidence provided, the visitors could not determine how the factsheet would be an adequate replacement for the training session, enabling the education provider to demonstrate that DMPs have undertaken the appropriate training. In addition the visitors could not determine how the education provider had assessed the training needs for DMPs in creating the new training model. Therefore the visitors require further information which demonstrates how the new fact sheet ensures that all DMPs, including new DMPs receive the appropriate training to ensure that they can fulfil their role of a DMP.

Suggested documentation: documentation that demonstrates how the new fact sheet ensures that DMPs undertake appropriate training. Any evidence provided should clearly demonstrate how the education provider has assessed the training needs of DMPs and how these needs are addressed in the new training model.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	De Montfort University
Programme title	Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of postal review	22 March 2017

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
 - Internal NSS summary
 - Patient advisor person specification
 - Strategy for public patient involvement
 - Volunteer hearing test feedback
 - 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.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	De Montfort University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Human Communication – Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Ball (Radiographer) Lucy Myers (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
 - Interview timetable
 - Communication workshop documentation
 - Major Change notification forms
 - Curriculum modification forms
 - Service user involvement in teaching sessions documentation
 - Service User Advisory Group documentation

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

Name of education provider	De Montfort University
Programme title	Graduate Certificate in Non Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Supplementary prescriber) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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 enhancement plan
 - Curriculum vitae of programme staff
 - Service user questionnaire
 - Programme timetable

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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

D.7 The designated medical practitioner must undertake appropriate training.

Reason: The visitors noted that the designated medical practitioner (DMP) training had poor attendance, and in response the education provider replaced the training session with a factsheet that is sent to all DMPs. Based on the evidence provided, the visitors could not determine how the factsheet would be an adequate replacement for the training session, enabling the education provider to demonstrate that DMPs have undertaken the appropriate training. In addition the visitors could not determine how the education provider had assessed the training needs for DMPs in creating the new training model. Therefore the visitors require further information which demonstrates how the new fact sheet ensures that all DMPs, including new DMPs receive the appropriate training to ensure that they can fulfil their role of a DMP.

Suggested documentation: documentation that demonstrates how the new fact sheet ensures that DMPs undertake appropriate training. Any evidence provided should clearly demonstrate how the education provider has assessed the training needs of DMPs and how these needs are addressed in the new training model.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	De Montfort University
Programme title	Post Graduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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 enhancement plan
 - Curriculum vitae of programme staff
 - Service user questionnaire
 - Programme timetable

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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

D.7 The designated medical practitioner must undertake appropriate training.

Reason: The visitors noted that the designated medical practitioner (DMP) training had poor attendance, and in response the education provider replaced the training session with a factsheet that is sent to all DMPs. Based on the evidence provided, the visitors could not determine how the factsheet would be an adequate replacement for the training session, enabling the education provider to demonstrate that DMPs have undertaken the appropriate training. In addition the visitors could not determine how the education provider had assessed the training needs for DMPs in creating the new training model. Therefore the visitors require further information which demonstrates how the new fact sheet ensures that all DMPs, including new DMPs receive the appropriate training to ensure that they can fulfil their role of a DMP.

Suggested documentation: documentation that demonstrates how the new fact sheet ensures that DMPs undertake appropriate training. Any evidence provided should clearly demonstrate how the education provider has assessed the training needs of DMPs and how these needs are addressed in the new training model.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Exeter
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Lincoln Simmons (Clinical psychologist) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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 team CV's
 - Sample of service user and carer involvement
 - Doctorate in clinical psychology training committee meeting
 - Curriculum review meeting minutes
 - British Psychological Society accreditation feedback and outcome letter
 - University and NHS trust contract performance management meeting agenda, minutes, action plan, responses and timetable for meeting requirements

- Recruitment and selection policy, with equality and diversity updates
- Minutes of feedback session for Neuropsychology Series, Year 1 Sessions

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 visitor	2
Section five: Visitor comments.....	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Exeter
Programme title	Educational, Child and Community Psychology (D.Ed.Psy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
 - Extracts of documents relating to SET 3.17

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provider has provided extracts from several documents that note the areas where service users and carers may be involved in the programme. However, it was not clear from this information whether this involvement was formal and ongoing, or the reason(s) that service users and carers were involved in the way they had been. For example, the education provider has noted that “stake holders from parent partnership [were involved] in the interview process” this year, but did not provide a rationale about how this involvement was relevant, what impact it had on the selection of trainees, or how the individuals were supported to be effective in their role. Therefore, the visitor was unclear how service users and carers would be effectively and appropriately involved in the programme on an ongoing basis.

Suggested documentation: Information that demonstrates how service users and carers will be effectively and appropriately involved in the programme on an ongoing basis, for example, a service user and carer involvement strategy.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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: Visitor comments

The visitor noted that the printed submission cut out a significant amount of information in the external examiner (EE) reports, and that the responses to EE reports were often not fully completed (for example, Date Report Received field left blank, pro-forma text not

deleted or replaced). These issues made the submission difficult to follow and understand, and particularly, it was not always clear whether issues had been addressed by the programme. Therefore, the visitor suggests that the education provider considers readability of this documentation for external audiences, particularly when next submitting annual monitoring documentation to the HCPC.

In response to comments made by the external examiners, the education provider has noted that “[t]he college is currently reviewing the administrative arrangements” for the programme and that “the current administrative staff are undergoing transformation”. Although no changes have yet been finalised in this area, the visitor noted that this could impact on administrative support for students and staff, and therefore the way the SETs are met. As such, this should be flagged to the HCPC via the appropriate monitoring process if and when changes are made.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Greenwich
Name of validating body	Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich
Programme title	Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist) Dawn Blenkin (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Validation document 2012
 - Service user forum minutes

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

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	Practice Certificate in IP for Physiotherapists, Podiatrists and Therapeutic Radiographers
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Independent prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Paul bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider did not map any evidence regarding the involvement of service users and carers in the programme. They did find reference regarding the involvement targets for the programme in the internal quality reports, however the education provider did not provide any evidence to demonstrate the ways in which service users and carers are involved in the programme. As such the visitors could not determine how service users and carers are involved in the programme and require additional evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding how service users and carers are involved in the programme, such as a service user and carer strategy document specific to this programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for Diagnostic Radiographers and Dietitians
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Supplementary prescriber) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider did not map any evidence regarding the involvement of service users and carers in the programme. They did find reference regarding the involvement targets for the programme in the internal quality reports, however the education provider did not provide any evidence to demonstrate the ways in which service users and carers are involved in the programme. As such the visitors could not determine how service users and carers are involved in the programme and require additional evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding how service users and carers are involved in the programme, such as a service user and carer strategy document specific to this programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers 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

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Tracey Clephan (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
 - Definitive Module Documents
 - Programme Handbook
 - Practice Education Handbooks
 - University policies and regulations
 - Student A-Z support available

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the internal quality report 2015-2016 that service users and carers are involved in the interviewing of students during the admissions process. However, apart from the involvement of service users in the interviewing of students, the visitors did not see evidence of how this involvement is appropriate to the programme and how service users are supported in their role. As such, the visitors require further evidence of service user and carer involvement in the programme, how they are supported and why this involvement is appropriate for this programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about service user and carer involvement in the programme. Any additional evidence should explain and justify how this involvement

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 that the education provider will be making changes to the curriculum for the 2017-2018 academic year. The visitors noted in the internal quality report that the education provider will be changing their curriculum following an internal university validation. The visitors recommend that the education provider submits a major change notification as the changes will be scrutinised within that process as the annual monitoring process is a retrospective process only.

The visitors also recommend that when there are no changes the education provider should not send documentation to support those standards as they have been previously looked at through other HCPC processes. On the other hand where there are changes the education provider should map it as a change on the audit mapping document.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Pollard (Paramedic) Kenneth Street (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	7 March 2017

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
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Student progression and achievement list
 - Emails confirming service user and carer involvement

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

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

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Ball (Therapeutic radiographer) Lucy Myers (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
 - Staff and roles with updated curriculum vitae
 - Questions for patient journey session
 - Admissions report
 - Periodic review including service user feedback
 - Extract of an email from Carers in Hertfordshire
 - Service user strategy

- Programme specification changes summaries

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 changes have been made to the interview process and entry requirements. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that all changes relating to the last two academic years should be clearly mapped in the mapping document. The visitors also noted that the mapping document included changes to the programme for the 2016-17 academic year which do not apply to the annual monitoring process as it is a retrospective process. The visitors would like the education provider to consider whether these changes need to be reported to the HCPC via the major change process which is both a prospective and retrospective process.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Pollard (Paramedic) Kenneth Street (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	7 March 2017

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
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Student progression and achievement list
 - Emails confirming service user and carer involvement

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

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

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Tracey Clephan (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider had mapped various ways to demonstrate how they involve service users and carers in the programme. However, from a review of the documentary submission the visitors could not locate the evidence that was mapped to support this standard. The visitors did not see evidence of the involvement of service users, how this involvement is appropriate to the programme and how service users are supported in their role. As such, the visitors require further evidence of service user and carer involvement in the programme, how they are supported and why this involvement is appropriate for this programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about service user and carer involvement in the programme, how this involvement is appropriate to the programme and how service users are supported in their role.

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 action plan that the education provider will be recruiting a new member of staff to ensure that they maintain an adequate number of staff members to deliver the programme. From the action plan the education provider has stated that they currently have an adequate number of experienced and qualified staff to deliver the programme. However the visitors would recommend that the education provider engages with us through the major change process if this will affect our standards around adequate numbers of staff to deliver an effective programme. Furthermore, the visitors noted that due to the movement of services outside the NHS, this may affect the number of placements currently available to the education provider. The education provider will again need to inform the HCPC through the major change process if this will affect our standards around the number and range of placements available to students.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	Postgraduate Certificate Applied Mental Health Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Patricia Higham (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Brendon Edmonds
Date of assessment day	13 March 2017

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
- Evidence to meet SET 3.17

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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.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 an appropriate professional register

Reason: The visitors noted the programme leader has changed to Dr. Phil Antony. However, the visitors did not receive a copy of the curriculum vitae (CV) for the new programme leader in the audit submission. The visitors require further evidence to ensure the new programme leader is appropriately qualified and experienced.

Suggested documentation: The CV of the new programme leader.

B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme

Reason: The visitors noted there have been changes to programme team members, however they did not receive any further supporting evidence regarding the new members in place. In addition, they did not find any evidence of how these changes have impacted on the overall delivery of the programme. To ensure this standard continues to be met, the visitors require further evidence of the qualifications and experience of the new team members and further information regarding the overall number of staff now in place to deliver the programme.

Suggested documentation: Staff CV's for the new programme team members and evidence of the overall number of staff in place to deliver the programme.

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge

Reason: The visitors noted there have been changes to programme team members, however they did not receive any further supporting evidence regarding the new members in place. In addition, they did not find any evidence of how these changes have impacted on the overall delivery of the programme. To ensure this standard continues to be met, the visitors require further evidence of the areas of the programme the new members of staff are involved in and how this is appropriate to the delivery of the different subject areas of the programme.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the subject areas of the programme the new team members are involved in delivering.

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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes 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

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Lincoln Simmonds (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
- Issues, Actions and Outcomes of Student Panel Meetings document
- National student survey verbatim comments document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In reading the audit submission the visitors noted that there was no evidence provided to demonstrate how this programme meets this standard. The visitors also noted that in the annual monitoring audit form there is a statement which articulates that the way the programme was going to involve service users and carers has not altered since these plans were highlighted at the approval visit in 2013. However, the way the programme could meet this standard was not assessed at the approval visit, and information has not been provided in any previous annual monitoring submission. As such the HCPC has not assessed how the programme can meet this standard. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the service users and carers are being involved in this programme. This evidence should highlight the type of involvement of the service users and carers, which service users and carers have been involved and why both the involvement, and the people are appropriate for this programme.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the service user and carer involvement in the programme, how service users and carers are chosen to be involved, and what support service users and carers receive to be able to undertake these roles.

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 in the evidence submitted there were specific examples cited of the work that the programme team had done to involve service users and carers in the programme. While the visitors are content that this standard is met, they noted that these examples were not dated and as such they could not identify when the activity took place. To facilitate an easy assessment of evidence provided the visitors recommend that the programme team date any examples of specific activity that involves service users and carers in any future annual monitoring submissions.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	BSc (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Blythe (Social worker in England) Patricia Higham (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	27 February 2017

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
 - Overview of management structure
 - Module specification
 - Admissions process summary
 - 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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the module descriptors and admissions process that there was information regarding how the service users and carers are involved in the programme. However the visitors did not receive any information about how service users and carers were appropriately supported and trained for the programme. The visitors were therefore unsure about how the education provider ensures that the service users and carers are given the appropriate tools to be involved in the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate what support and training is available to service users and carers.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the audit form that the education provider had mapped a change to the curriculum. The education provider had mentioned that there was a “recent revalidation of a new curriculum”. However the visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted. The visitors were unsure as to whether the “recent revalidation of the new curriculum” had changed substantially from previous curriculum and were unable to determine whether there are any changes to the learning outcomes, and therefore the delivery of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the revalidated new curriculum, including the learning outcomes.

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

Reason:

From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the audit form that the education provider had mapped a change to the curriculum. The education provider had mentioned that there was a “recent revalidation of a new curriculum”. However the visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted. The visitors were unsure as to whether the “recent revalidation of the new curriculum” had changed substantially from previous curriculum and were unable to determine whether any changes have been made to the assessment of the learning

outcomes, and therefore the achievement of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the revalidated new curriculum, including the assessment strategy.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Prescription only medicines – sale / supply Prescription only medicines – administration
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist / Prescription only medicines – administration / and Prescription only medicines – sale / supply) Emma Supple (Chiropodist / podiatrist/ Prescription only medicines – administration / and Prescription only medicines – sale / supply)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	11 April 2017

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 handbook

- Email regarding public involvement
- Focus group write up
- Recruitment poster
- Application service user focus group
- Consent form focus group
- Thank you letter focus group
- Selection day questions interview questions
- Patient involvement module 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

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Tracey Clephan (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
 - Service user and carer involvement documents

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

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	Clinical Pharmacology for Podiatrists
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist / Prescription only medicines – sale / supply) Emma Supple (Chiropodist / podiatrist/ Prescription only medicines – sale / supply)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	11 April 2017

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 specification

The module runs every other year due to the MSc programme design, therefore documents are supplied for 14-15 academic year, this is the last time the module ran. It is in the process of running again this year.

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence sent for this submission. Whilst they noted that the education provider had mapped against this standard, no evidence was provided to support the mapping. Therefore the visitors were unclear of the role of service users and carers in the programme. As such, the visitors require evidence of service user and carer involvement in the programme and why this involvement is appropriate for the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence about the appropriate service user and carer involvement in 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

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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
- Teaching timetable
- Service user and carer strategy
- Specialist skills board minutes
- Confirmation of appointment of new 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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider had not submitted the responses to the external examiner reports as they are not required. However when considering the external examiner reports, the visitors noted that there was feedback, comments and recommendations made by the external examiners which would warrant a response by the programme team. Moreover the visitors noted comments at the bottom of the external examiner reports stating that a response from the programme team will be returned to the external examiner. Considering that the responses to the external examiner reports were not included as part of the audit, the visitors could not determine that the programme has regular monitoring and evaluation of the programme. Therefore the visitors require additional documentation that demonstrates how the education provider has responded to the comments of the external examiner, ensuring that the programme has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Suggested documentation: Responses to the external examiner reports from the last two years.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers 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

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	MSc Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Blythe (Social worker in England) Patricia Higham (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	27 February 2017

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
 - Overview of management structure
 - Module specification
 - Admissions process summary

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.

2.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the internal quality report 2014-2015 that some students had to pay for their travel within placements. The visitors did not see any evidence to demonstrate how applicants are told about additional costs, in particular around the travel costs. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate how the admissions information informs applicants about additional costs for the programme, in order to give them the information they require to make an informed choice about the whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the module descriptors and admissions process that there was information regarding how the service users and carers are involved in the programme. However the visitors did not receive any information about how service users and carers are appropriately supported and trained for the programme. The visitors were therefore unsure about how the education provider ensures that the service users and carers are given the appropriate tools to be involved in the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate what support and training is available to service users and carers.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the audit form that the education provider had mapped a change to the curriculum. The education provider had mentioned that there was a “recent revalidation of a new curriculum”. However the visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted. The visitors were unsure as to whether the “recent revalidation of the new curriculum” had changed substantially from previous curriculum and were unable to determine whether there are any changes to the learning outcomes, and therefore the delivery of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the revalidated new curriculum, including the learning outcomes.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the audit form that the education provider had mapped a change to the curriculum. The education provider had mentioned that there was a “recent revalidation of a new curriculum”. However the visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted. The visitors were unsure as to whether the “recent revalidation of the new curriculum” had changed substantially from previous curriculum and were unable to determine whether any changes have been made to the assessment of the learning outcomes, and therefore the achievement of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the revalidated new curriculum, including the assessment strategy.

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	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Kent
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England) Kate Johnson (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	13 March 2017

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
 - BA (Hons) Social work programme specification
 - Partnership Initiative Progress Report 2014
 - Partnership Initiative minutes

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 documentation the visitors noted in the internal quality report for 2015-2016 that five academic staff members left the programme. The education provider also mentioned that they have recruited permanent academic staff members to replace the staff that have left. However, from the documentation provided the visitors did not see how many new staff members have been recruited and did not receive any evidence to demonstrate that the number of staff for this programme is adequate and that they are appropriately qualified and experienced to deliver an effective programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of staff members to effectively deliver this programme and that they are appropriately experienced and qualified.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the internal quality report for 2015-2016 that the education provider has mentioned that five academic staff members left the programme which has led to the discontinuity of some modules. However the visitors did not receive any documentation to support the changes to the curriculum and a major change notification form has not been submitted to the HCPC to demonstrate any changes. The visitors were unsure as to whether the discontinuity of some of the modules and changes to the curriculum had changed substantially from the previous curriculum. The visitors were unable to determine whether there are any changes to the learning outcomes, and therefore the delivery of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the changes to the curriculum, including the learning outcomes.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the internal quality report for 2014- 2015 that the education provider has made changes to the curriculum by making "revisions to the stage 3 modules". However the visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted to the

HPCP. The visitors were unsure as to whether the revisions to the curriculum had changed substantially from the previous curriculum and were unable to determine whether there are any changes to the learning outcomes, and therefore the delivery of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the revisions to the stage 3 modules including the learning outcomes.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the internal quality report for 2014- 2015 that the education provider has made changes to the curriculum by making “revisions to the stage 3 modules”. However the visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted to the HPCP. The visitors were unsure as to whether the revisions to the curriculum had changed substantially from previous curriculum and were unable to determine whether any changes have been made to the assessment of the learning outcomes, and therefore the achievement of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the revised curriculum, including the assessment strategy.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted in the external examiner’s report for 2014-2015 that the education provider has made changes to their assessments by making changes to the word count of some module assessments. However the visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form has not been submitted. The visitors were unsure as to whether there has been substantial changes to the assessment methods and were unable to determine whether the changes to the assessment methods employed were appropriate to measure the learning outcomes.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the revised assessment methods for the changed modules.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted in the external examiner’s report for 2014-2015 that the education provider had not addressed the external examiner’s comments regarding over assessment. The visitors did not receive a full response to the external examiner’s concerns. The visitors could therefore not determine how the education provider ensures that there are effective evaluation and monitoring processes in place to adequately address the issues raised by the external examiner, in particular around the appropriate standards for assessments.

Suggested documentation: Further information to demonstrate that there are effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

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

Name of education provider	University of Kent
Programme title	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England) Kate Johnson (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	13 March 2017

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
 - MA Social Work programme specification
 - Partnership Initiative Progress Report 2014
 - Partnership Initiative minutes

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: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that there were some pages missing in the external examiner's report for the 2014-2015 academic year. As such the visitors could not assess whether there have been any changes to the programme and whether these changes would affect how the programme continues to meet our standards. Therefore the education provider did not submit a full submission of their monitoring and evaluation documentation and the visitors could not determine whether there were appropriate monitoring and evaluation systems in place to ensure the programme's effectiveness. The visitors will therefore need to see evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that there are effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place to effectively deliver the programme that could include but not limited to the missing pages for the external examiner's report.

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 documentation the visitors noted in the internal quality report for 2015-2016 that there are issues relating to staff turnover. Furthermore, the education provider has stated that they have experienced some difficulties delivering the programme to a high standard. The education provider has mentioned that to address the staffing issues they are currently working with the head of school to address the issues. From a review of the documentation the visitors are clear that the education provider recognises that there are staffing issues however, the visitors could not determine what formal plans there are in place to adequately address the staffing issues. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that there are formal plans in place to sufficiently address the staffing issues and also how these plans will result in there being an adequate number of staff in place to effectively deliver this programme and that they are appropriately experienced and qualified.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted in the internal quality reports for the years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 that there were some issues with their room booking system, Moodle and there were further issues in finding and keeping

suitable teaching rooms. From a review of the documentation the visitors are clear that the education provider recognises that there are resource issues however, the visitors could not determine what formal plans there are in place to adequately address the resource issues. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that there are adequate resources in place to support student learning in all settings and that these resources effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Kent
Programme title	PG Diploma in Social Work (masters exit route only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England) Kate Johnson (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	13 March 2017

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
- MA Social work programme specification
- Partnership Initiative Progress Report 2014
- Partnership Initiative minutes

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: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that there were some pages missing in the external examiner's report for the 2014-2015 academic year. As such the visitors could not assess whether there have been any changes to the programme and whether these changes would affect how the programme continues to meet our standards. Therefore the education provider did not submit a full submission of their monitoring and evaluation documentation and the visitors could not determine whether there were appropriate monitoring and evaluation systems in place to ensure the programme's effectiveness. The visitors will therefore need to see evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that there are effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place to effectively deliver the programme that could include but not limited to the missing pages for the external examiner's report.

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 documentation the visitors noted in the internal quality report for 2015-2016 that there are issues relating to staff turnover. Furthermore, the education provider has stated that they have experienced some difficulties delivering the programme to a high standard. The education provider has mentioned that to address the staffing issues they are currently working with the head of school to address the issues. From a review of the documentation the visitors are clear that the education provider recognises that there are staffing issues however, the visitors could not determine what formal plans there are in place to adequately address the staffing issues. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that there are formal plans in place to sufficiently address the staffing issues and also how these plans will result in there being an adequate number of staff in place to effectively deliver this programme and that they are appropriately experienced and qualified.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted in the internal quality reports for the years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 that there were some issues with their room booking system, Moodle and there were further issues in finding and keeping suitable teaching rooms. From a review of the documentation the visitors are clear that the

education provider recognises that there are resource issues however, the visitors could not determine what formal plans there are in place to adequately address the resource issues. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that there are adequate resources in place to support student learning in all settings and that these resources effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Kingston University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England) Kate Johnson (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	13 March 2017

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
 - Service user and carer Steering group minutes
 - Changes to programmes/ fields by delegated powers forms
 - Fitness to practise procedures

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 documentation the visitors noted in the internal quality report for 2015-2016 that the education provider has highlighted staff related issues. The education provider has mentioned that due to staff retirement and illnesses the existing team had to take on additional workload. The education provider did not submit any evidence to demonstrate that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and staff to deliver an effective programme. From the documentation provided the visitors could not see how the education provider is effectively addressing the staffing issues and could therefore not determine whether there is adequate number appropriately qualified and experience staff team to deliver the programme effectively. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of staff members to effectively deliver this programme and that they are appropriately experienced and qualified.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted in the internal quality report for 2015-2016 that the education provider was having some difficulties with the “Kingston University and St. George’s email convergence arrangements”. Furthermore, the education provider has highlighted that this has had an impact on a significant number of students’ inaccessibility to their university emails for considerable periods of time. From a review of the documentation the visitors could not see how the education provider has adequately addressed this issue. The visitors could therefore not determine if the resources, namely the university email convergence arrangements are appropriate and readily available to students and staff. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that the resources, namely the university email convergence arrangements are appropriate and readily available for staff and students.

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

Name of education provider	Kingston University
Programme title	Masters in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England) Kate Johnson (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	13 March 2017

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
 - Service user and carer Steering group minutes
 - Changes to programmes/ fields by delegated powers documents

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.

2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted in the internal quality report for 2014-2015 that changes have been made to the admissions process. The education provider has stated they will be moving the criminal convictions checks that applicant previously undertook during the admissions process to before the students on the programme undertake their practice learning. Due to the change the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that the admissions procedures applies criminal convictions checks as part of the selection and entry criteria.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about how the admissions procedures applies criminal convictions checks as part of the selection and entry criteria.

2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted in the internal quality report for 2014-2015 that changes have been made to the admissions process. The education provider has stated they will be moving the health requirement checks that applicants previously undertook as part of the admissions process to before the students on the programme undertake their practice learning. Due to the change the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that the admissions procedures applies selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate how the admissions procedures applies selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the internal quality report 2014-2015 that the education provider has highlighted changes to the placement module (SW6008), which was approved by their internal faculty quality committee. The visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted to the HCPC detailing this change. The visitors were unsure as to whether the revised placement module had changed substantially from the original placement module and were unable to determine whether there are any changes to the learning outcomes, and therefore the delivery of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The

visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the revised placement module, including the learning outcomes.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the internal quality report 2014-2015 that the education provider has highlighted changes to the placement module (SW6008) and changes to the assessment of the module, which was approved by their internal faculty quality committee. The visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted to the HCPC detailing this change. The visitors were unsure of the whether the revised placement module had changed substantially from the original placement module and were unable to determine whether any changes have been made to the assessment of the learning outcomes, and therefore the achievement of the standards of proficiency (SOPs),. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about revised placement module, including the assessment strategy.

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

Name of education provider	Kingston University
Programme title	PD Dip in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England) Kate Johnson (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	13 March 2017

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
- Service user and carer Steering group minutes
- Changes to programmes/ fields by delegated powers documents

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.

2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted in the internal quality report for 2014-2015 that changes have been made to the admissions process. The education provider has stated they will be moving the criminal convictions checks that applicant previously undertook during the admissions process to before the students on the programme undertake their practice learning. Due to the change the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that the admissions procedures applies criminal convictions checks as part of the selection and entry criteria.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about how the admissions procedures applies criminal convictions checks as part of the selection and entry criteria.

2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted in the internal quality report for 2014-2015 that changes have been made to the admissions process. The education provider has stated they will be moving the health requirement checks that applicants previously undertook as part of the admissions process to before the students on the programme undertake their practice learning. Due to the change the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that the admissions procedures applies selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate how the admissions procedures applies selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the internal quality report 2014-2015 that the education provider has highlighted changes to the placement module (SW6008), which was approved by their internal faculty quality committee. The visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted to the HCPC detailing this change. The visitors were unsure as to whether the revised placement module had changed substantially from the original placement module and were unable to determine whether there are any changes to the learning outcomes, and therefore the delivery of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The

visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the revised placement module, including the learning outcomes.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the internal quality report 2014-2015 that the education provider has highlighted changes to the placement module (SW6008) and changes to the assessment of the module, which was approved by their internal faculty quality committee. The visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted to the HCPC detailing this change. The visitors were unsure of the whether the revised placement module had changed substantially from the original placement module and were unable to determine whether any changes have been made to the assessment of the learning outcomes, and therefore the achievement of the standards of proficiency (SOPs),. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about revised placement module, including the assessment strategy.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Lancaster
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - HEI evidence template to assesses compliance against ECQ indicators
 - Introduction to changes in the admissions process 2017
 - Lancaster DClinPsy programme admissions: the tower task

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	1
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Lancaster
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England) Kate Johnson (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	13 March 2017

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
 - Practice Assessment Panel process
 - PAP process for assessing placement reports flowchart
 - Service User and Carer involvement documents
 - Recruitment documents
 - Fitness to Practice process
 - Social Work Degree- Education Support Grant Financial certificate

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.

3.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted in the internal quality report for the 2015-2016 that the education provider had recruited new academic staff for the programme. However from the documentation provider the visitors did not receive any evidence to demonstrate that subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that the recruited academic staff have the relevant specialist skills and knowledge to deliver this programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Lancaster
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England) Kate Johnson (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	13 March 2017

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
 - Practice Assessment Panel process
 - PAP process for assessing placement reports flowchart
 - Service User and Carer involvement documents
 - Recruitment documents
 - Fitness to Practice process
 - Social Work Degree- Education Support Grant Financial certificate

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.

3.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted in the internal quality report for the 2015-2016 that the education provider had recruited new academic staff for the programme. However from the documentation provider the visitors did not receive any evidence to demonstrate that subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that the recruited academic staff have the relevant specialist skills and knowledge to deliver this programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Lancaster
Programme title	Master of Social Work with Honours in Social Work, Ethics and Religion
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England) Kate Johnson (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	13 March 2017

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
- Practice Assessment Panel process
- PAP process for assessing placement reports flowchart
- Service User and Carer involvement documents
- Recruitment documents
- Fitness to Practice process
- Social Work Degree- Education Support Grant Financial certificate

The education provider submitted documentation for the BA (Hons) Social work programme. The education provider highlighted in the BA (Hons) Social work internal quality report for 2015-2016 and the audit form that the first cohort of students for the Master of Social Work with Honours in Social Work, Ethics and Religion programme started in the 2016-2017 academic year, although the programme was due to commence in the 2015-2016 academic year. As such there have been no internal quality and external examiners reports and responses produced for this programme. As the programme is being delivered from this academic year the HCPC will need to review the documentation once they become available in a future annual monitoring 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	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Leeds
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic Radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	16 February 2017

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 timetables

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.

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

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, specifically the action plans from modules reviews for 2014-15 and 2015-16, the visitors noted numerous changes to the curriculum. The changes included modules no longer being delivered or merged and changes to the way some modules are being assessed. It is not clear when the changes were implemented or if they have yet been implemented. As such, the visitors are not clear about how the learning outcomes associated with those modules have been impacted. Therefore the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates that the learning outcomes for the programme ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for proficiency for diagnostic radiographers.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how the learning outcomes in any revised modules ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register, such as a SOPs mapping document. Any documentation provided should clearly outline what changes have been made to the modules and how they impact how the SOPs are met.

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

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, specifically the action plans from modules reviews for 2014-15 and 2015-16, the visitors noted numerous changes to the curriculum. The changes included modules no longer being delivered and changes to the way some modules are being assessed. It is not clear when the changes were implemented or if indeed they have yet been implemented. As such, the visitors are not clear about how the modules have changed and how the assessment strategy and design has been impacted as a result. Therefore the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates that the assessment strategy and design ensures that those who successfully complete the programme have met the standards for proficiency for diagnostic radiographers.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how the learning outcomes in any revised modules ensure that those who successfully complete the programme have met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register, such as a SOPs mapping document. Any documentation provided should clearly outline what changes have been made to the modules and how they impact how the SOPs are met.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Leicester
Programme title	Dip HE in Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Ruth Baker (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Lecturer in ODP Job Summary
 - Teaching Fellow in ODP Education Job Summary
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - University Based Practical Teaching document
 - Service User and carer documents

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

Name of education provider	University of Lincoln
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma Interprofessional Practice (Approved Mental Health Professional)
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Lynda Kelly (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
- Although some documentation was provided from two years ago, this related to the predecessor AMHP programme at the education provider, and was therefore not relevant to this submission. The visitors considered information relating to the 2015-16 academic year only

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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Lincoln
Programme title	MSc Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social Work
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Dicken (Social worker in England) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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 Enhancement Plan (PEP) QA Report,
 - Service User Involvement 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 five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin.Psychol)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Lincoln Simmonds (Clinical psychologist) Stephen Davies (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	6 April 2017

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
 - Admissions documentation
 - Open day documentation
 - Education provider nomination form for learning and teaching
 - Management document for the programme
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Placement contract templates

- Update letter to British Psychological Society (BPS)
- Module descriptors
- Portfolio guidance document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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 happy that the programme continues to meet the standards. However the visitors advise the Programme Director to continue to monitor the efficacy of the Research Director being employed within another school, to ensure that the role remains effective for the programme management.

The visitors also noted that the education provider is revising the programme by introducing rated videos of trainee's practice to reflect the new BPS competencies. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that it should engage with the HCPC major process should the changes made have impact on the programme's ability to meet the standards of proficiency for the Practitioner psychologists.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Orthoptics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Orthoptist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Timms (Orthoptist) Helen Griffiths (Orthoptist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	2 March 2017

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

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

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Tracy Clephan (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
 - National Student Survey scores and action plans
 - Entry qualification information
 - iPad and Liftupp guide
 - Attendance policy
 - Student handbook
 - Programme specification
 - Module specifications
 - Timetables

- Information regarding service users
- Introductory educators course information
- Placement schedule
- Supporting lecturer meeting form
- Code of practice on assessment

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

From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that the education provider has proposed changes to the assessment methods of the programme. It is proposed that these assessment changes did not commence until this academic year (2016-2017). The education provider submitted module descriptors and a programme specification to support these changes. However, the visitors noted that the changes proposed in the module descriptors were not reflected in the programme specification. Furthermore, these changes do not fall within the last two academic years (2014-15 and 2015-16) being reviewed as part of this annual monitoring audit. The visitors recommend that the education provider submits a major change notification form, highlighting the changes they have made to their assessment methods, and that these changes are reflected consistently and accurately in the programme 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 one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme title	Pg Dip Radiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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 report for last year has yet to be approved and therefore was not included in the documents provided.

- Booking form for service user to attend selection day as part of the interview panel.
- Screen shot of timetable indicating session for RADT625.
- Student evaluation following the visits to Lyndale Cancer Support Centre.
- Newsletter story reporting student volunteers at Lyndale Cancer Support Centre.
- Screenshot of timetable indicating session for RADT

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

Name of education provider	London Metropolitan University
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Counselling psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Packwood (Counselling psychologist) Antony Ward (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Summary of User's Group day with Year 3 trainees within module PY8PB8, relating to new standard, item 3.17

The response to the external examiner's report two years ago is not included because they say they did not submit a response

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Mary Hare
Name of validating body	Edexcel
Programme title	Higher National Diploma Hearing Aid Audiology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser) John Donaghy (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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 2015-2017
 - Work Place Mentor Handbook
 - Service user and carer involvement strategy
 - Unit Leaders Meeting minutes

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

Name of education provider	Middlesex University
Programme title	BA (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Blythe (Social worker in England) Patricia Higham (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	27 February 2017

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.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the external examiners reports and the response to the external examiners reports that the education provider has made “adaptations” to the curriculum. However the visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted. The visitors were unsure as to whether the adaptations to the curriculum had changed substantially from the previous curriculum and were unable to determine whether there are any changes to the learning outcomes, and therefore the delivery of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the adapted curriculum, including the learning outcomes.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the external examiners reports and the response to the external examiners reports that the education provider has made “adaptations” to the curriculum. However the visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted. The visitors were unsure as to whether the adaptations to the curriculum had changed substantially from previous curriculum and were unable to determine whether any changes have been made to the assessment of the learning outcomes, and therefore the achievement of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the adapted curriculum, including the assessment strategy.

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 same documentation was submitted for both the BA (Hons) and MA social work programme. The visitors suggest that the education provider considers relating documentation specifically to individual programmes in the future monitoring processes.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Middlesex University
Programme title	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Blythe (Social worker in England) Patricia Higham (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	27 February 2017

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.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the external examiners reports and the response to the external examiners reports that the education provider has made “adaptations” to the curriculum. However the visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted. The visitors were unsure as to whether the adaptations to the curriculum had changed substantially from the previous curriculum and were unable to determine whether there are any changes to the learning outcomes, and therefore the delivery of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the adapted curriculum, including the learning outcomes.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the external examiners reports and the response to the external examiners reports that the education provider has made “adaptations” to the curriculum. However the visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted. The visitors were unsure as to whether the adaptations to the curriculum had changed substantially from previous curriculum and were unable to determine whether any changes have been made to the assessment of the learning outcomes, and therefore the achievement of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the adapted curriculum, including the assessment strategy.

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 same documentation was submitted for both the BA (Hons) and MA social work programme. The visitors suggest that the education provider considers relating documentation specifically to individual programmes in the future monitoring processes.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Middlesex University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	27 February 2017

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.

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

Reason: From the visitors' reading of the documentation, the quality document for 2014 – 2015 discussed the opening of new laboratories and how these had enhanced student learning and the satisfaction rates for the student survey had increased by ten percent. The visitors did not receive any documentation relating to the new laboratories and were therefore unclear if the resources to support students in all settings are being effectively used within the new laboratories. Therefore the visitors require further documentation that demonstrates how the new laboratories support student learning for the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates how the new laboratories support student learning for the programme.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors in their reading could not see any direct evidence of the how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The education provider provided no evidence within the audit document or other documents provided. The visitors could not see where and how service users are involved in this programme and if there is any training and development for the service users and carers. Therefore the visitors require evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in 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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors agreed that the standard for service users and carers is met. However they would like the education provider to consider further developing service users and carers within the programme and inform the HCPC of developments through the annual monitoring audits.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Middlesex University
Programme title	MSci Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	27 February 2017

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.

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

Reason: From the visitors reading of the documentation, the quality document for 2014 – 2015 discussed the opening of new laboratories and how these had enhanced student learning and the satisfaction rates for the student survey had increased by ten percent. The visitors did not receive any documentation relating to the new laboratories and were therefore unclear if the resources to support students in all settings are being effectively used within the new laboratories. Therefore the visitors require further documentation that demonstrates how the new laboratories support student learning for the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates how the new laboratories support student learning for 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

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber) James Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	23 February 2017

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 assessment tool
 - feedback from external examiner student work.

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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors noted that students on this programme interact with service users and carers when they are on placement. However, the visitors could not determine how service users are involved in the programme beyond this interaction. The visitors are also unclear, from the evidence provided, how the programme team determine the most appropriate service users to be involved in the programme and what training might be provided to ensure they can be appropriately involved. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team involve service users and carers in the programme beyond the interaction with students on placement. Also the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine which service users and carers should be involved in the programme and how this selection process ensures that service users and carers are supported in their involvement with the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers are selected for their involvement in the programme and how they are supported in the role of service users and carers whilst on 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber) James Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	23 February 2017

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 assessment tool
- feedback from external examiner student work.

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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors noted that students on this programme interact with service users and carers when they are on placement. However, the visitors could not determine how service users are involved in the programme beyond this interaction. The visitors are also unclear, from the evidence provided, how the programme team determine the most appropriate service users to be involved in the programme and what training might be provided to ensure they can be appropriately involved. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team involve service users and carers in the programme beyond the interaction with students on placement. Also the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine which service users and carers should be involved in the programme and how this selection process ensures that service users and carers are supported in their involvement with the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers are selected for their involvement in the programme and how they are supported in the role of service users and carers whilst on 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers 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 visitor	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Newcastle University
Programme title	Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
 - Supervisors Training Day Programme
 - Placement handbooks
 - Programme Handbook
 - Service User Group Terms of Reference
 - Notes of Service User Group meeting
 - Portfolio Feedback proforma
 - Programme regulations
 - 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 visitor

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Newcastle University
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James McManus (Practitioner psychologist) Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
 - Academic handbook
 - Clinical handbook
 - Programme regulations
 - Newcastle University website links
 - Entry on clearing house website
 - Moderation and scaling policy document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the programme handbook that the education provider is currently in the process of establishing a service user and carer advisory committee. The visitors also noted that service users have been involved in selection and teaching sessions. However, the visitors were unclear as to how these service users and carers are supported and prepared to undertake their role. As such, the visitors require further evidence in order to determine that this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence and information about how service users are supported to undertake their role.

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

Name of education provider	Newcastle University
Programme title	MSc Language Pathology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Ball (Radiographer) Lucy Myers (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
 - Fitness to Practise Procedure
 - Degree Programme Specifications
 - Degree Programme Regulations
 - Fitness to Study procedure
 - Clinical Placement Health and Safety Policy
 - Speech & Language Sciences Generic Handbook
 - Years 1 and 2 of Degree Programme Handbooks
 - Guides to Clinical and Professional Education

- MSc 1 and MSc 2 Clinical Evaluation Report (CER) Competencies
- Clinical Induction Slides for MSc 1 and MSc 2
- Royal College of Speech & Language Therapists (RCSLT) National Standards for Practice Based Learning
- Programmes of Clinical Education workshops
- Clinical Educator Placement packs
- Interview writing task document
- Offer letter (interview outcome)
- Pre-entry information letter
- Inter-professional Education Conference programme

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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has updated their fitness to practise policy which is utilised to deal with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. In scrutinising this evidence the visitors were clear that there was a process in place to deal with any issues around students' professional conduct and that it was being applied. However, from the evidence provided, the visitors could not see how students were informed about any opportunity to address identified issues with their professional conduct, before progressing to the formal fitness to practice procedure. As such the visitors could not determine if there is any such opportunity to address issues with conduct, or if every issue regarding questions around professional conduct is immediately escalated to the fitness to practice procedure. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence regarding how students are provided with information about any opportunity to address any issues with their profession-related conduct before they are subject to the formal fitness to practice procedures. In this way the visitors will be able to determine how the programme can continue to meet this standard.

Suggested documentation: Evidence which demonstrates that students are informed about their opportunities to address any issues that may be raised about their professional conduct before they are subject to the formal fitness to practice procedures.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From the evidence provided, the visitors noted that service users are involved in learning and teaching. The visitors were satisfied from the evidence provided that service users are involved in the programme and that this involvement is appropriate. However, the visitors did not see any evidence of how service users are supported or the information they receive in order to undertake their role on the programme. As such, the education

provider must provide further evidence about the support given to service users to undertake their role in order to determine how the standard can be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates how service users and carers have been supported to undertake their role on this programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors would like to remind the education provider that evidence should only be mapped and provided for the standards where changes have been made. In addition, evidence should only be provided for the last two academic years (2014-15 and 2015-16) for an annual monitoring audit in 2016-17.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Newcastle University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Sciences
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Ball (Radiographer) Lucy Myers (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
 - Quality assurance and feedback questionnaires
 - Fitness to study procedure
 - Fitness to practice procedure and code of professional conduct
 - Clinical evaluation reports
 - Guides to clinical and professional education
 - Placement health and safety policy
 - Practice educator workshops
 - General placement information packs

- Placement information for practice educators
- Planning and self-audit tools
- Programme handbooks
- General handbook
- Programme specification
- Programme regulations
- Inter-professional education conference 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.

2.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Reason: The visitors noted, in the mapping document, that the education provider has introduced interviews as part of the admissions procedures. However, the visitors did not receive any evidence about what information is obtained as part of this interview and how this allows the education provider to make an informed choice about whether to make an offer of a place on a programme. As such, the education provider should provide further evidence to demonstrate how the programme continues to meet this standard.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates that, as part of the admissions process, the interview gives the education provider the information they require in order to make an informed choice about whether to make an offer of a place on a programme.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has updated their fitness to practise policy which is utilised to deal with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. In scrutinising this evidence the visitors were clear that there was a process in place to deal with any issues around students' professional conduct and that it was being applied. However, from the evidence provided, the visitors could not see how students were informed about any opportunity to address identified issues with their professional conduct, before progressing to the formal fitness to practice procedure. As such the visitors could not determine if there is any such opportunity to address issues with conduct, or if every issue regarding questions around professional conduct is immediately escalated to the fitness to practice procedure. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence regarding how students are provided with information about any opportunity to address any issues with their profession-related conduct before they are subject to the formal fitness to practice procedures. In this way the visitors will be able to determine how the programme can continue to meet this standard.

Suggested documentation: Evidence which demonstrates that students are informed about their opportunities to address any issues that may be raised about their professional conduct before they are subject to the formal fitness to practice procedures.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From the evidence provided, the visitors noted that service users are involved in learning and teaching. The visitors were satisfied from the evidence provided that service users are involved in the programme and that this involvement is appropriate. However, the visitors did not see any evidence of how service users are supported or the information they receive in order to undertake their role on the programme. As such, the education provider must provide further evidence about the support given to service users to undertake their role in order to determine how the standard can be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates how service users and carers have been supported to undertake their role on this programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors would like to remind the education provider that evidence should only be mapped and provided for the standards where changes have been made. In addition, evidence should only be provided for the last two academic years (2014-15 and 2015-16) for an annual monitoring audit in 2016-17. The visitors also noted that the mapping document included future changes to the programme which do not apply to the annual monitoring process as it is a retrospective process. The visitors would like the education provider to consider whether these changes need to be reported to the HCPC via the major change process which is both a prospective and retrospective 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 visitor	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
Programme title	Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology (D.App.Ed.Psy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
 - Learning Outcomes and SOPs mapping
 - Course Reference Group Minutes
 - General Handbook
 - Group Supplement handbooks
 - Practice placement handbooks
 - Documentation relating to service user and carer involvement
 - Module descriptors and evaluations

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 visitor

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social Work
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Dicken (Social worker in England) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - BA Social Work Admissions Handbook
 - Terms of reference for Social work advisory group
 - January 2017 minutes from Social work advisory group
 - Curriculum vitae of Centre for Social Work staff
 - Overview of sessional tutors
 - BA (Hons) Social Work professional handbook
 - Handbook of practice learning
 - Summary of changes to Fitness to practice procedures
 - Overview of student placements for last year and current year

- Practice Learning Report pro forma
- PowerPoint slides from teaching session explaining PCF and KSS
- BA (Hons) Social Work 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

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James McManus (Clinical psychologist) Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
 - Annual report 2013-14 containing service user and carer 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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the evidence provided that service users and carers are involved in a number of ways on the programme such as selection and research. However, the visitors were not able to see any evidence to demonstrate that service users and carers are appropriately prepared and supported to undertake these roles. As such, they require further evidence that this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence and information about how service users and carers are prepared and supported to undertake their roles on 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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted from the response to the external examiner's report 2014-15 that the education provider was intending to make changes to how the clinical aspects of the programme are examined in the new research-focussed programme. Furthermore, the visitors noted from the last annual monitoring audit that there may be changes to how the programme will be funded. The visitors reviewed the current audit and were satisfied that funding is secure for the immediate future. However, if the education provider does make any changes, it should consider the impact that this will have on the standards of education and training and 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

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
Programme title	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social Work
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Dicken (Social worker in England) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - MA Social Work admissions handbook
 - Terms of reference for Social work advisory group.
 - January 2017 minutes from Social work advisory group
 - Curriculum vitae for Centre for Social work staff
 - Overview of sessional tutors
 - MA Social Work Handbook
 - Handbook of Practice Learning

- Summary of Changes to Fitness to Practice Procedures
- Overview of student placements for 2016 and 2017
- Practice Learning Report pro forma
- PowerPoint slides from teaching session explaining PCF and KSS
- MA Social Work (full-time) programme specification
- MA Social Work (part-time) programme specification
- Major Change Notification

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 major change submitted by the education provider where a decision had been made for the evidence to be submitted in the 2018 – 2019 HCPC annual monitoring audit. This change in the admissions process will come in to place in September 2017. The visitors suggest the education provider monitors this new process closely during the next two years and any impacts it may have. They also suggest that if the monitoring leads to any further changes the education provider should engage 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	2
Section five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
Programme title	PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social Work
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Dicken (Social worker in England) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - MA Social Work admissions handbook
 - Terms of reference for Social work advisory group.
 - January 2017 minutes from Social work advisory group
 - Curriculum vitae for Centre for Social work staff
 - Overview of sessional tutors
 - MA Social Work Handbook

- Handbook of Practice Learning
- Summary of Changes to Fitness to Practice Procedures
- Overview of student placements for 2016 and 2017
- Practice Learning Report pro forma
- PowerPoint slides from teaching session explaining PCF and KSS
- MA Social Work (full-time) programme specification
- MA Social Work (part-time) programme specification
- Major Change Notification

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 major change submitted by the education provider where a decision had been made for the evidence to be submitted in the 2018 – 2019 HCPC annual monitoring audit. This change in the admissions process will come in to place in September 2017. The visitors suggest the education provider monitors this new process closely during the next two years and any impacts it may have. They also suggest that if the monitoring leads to any further changes the education provider should engage 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	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	New School of Psychotherapy and Counselling and Middlesex University
Name of awarding / validating body	Middlesex University
Programme title	Doctorate in Counselling Psychology and Psychotherapy by Professional Studies (DCPsych)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Counselling psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Packwood (Counselling psychologist) Antony Ward (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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

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

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Lincoln Simmons (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
 - Service users and carers advisory group meeting
 - Service users and advisory group leaflet

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 submission for this programme and the Diploma in Higher Education (Dip HE) programme were provided to the HCPC together and there was evidence provided that was pertinent to both programmes. As HCPC scrutinise programmes individually through the annual monitoring process the shared nature of some of the evidence was not conducive to the effective assessment of the evidence. The visitors would therefore like to suggest that the education provider considers how best to submit documentation through the annual monitoring process in the future to clearly identify which evidence relates to which programme. Any further clarity would aid decision making about these programmes.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Brooks University
Programme title	BSc Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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
- Service user and carer strategy

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

At the annual monitoring day the visitors were made aware that the education provider had made changes to the curriculum of the FdSc Paramedic Science programme which were highlighted via the annual monitoring process. The visitors note that the BSc programme ran its first cohort in September 2016 and could not see any information about changes to the curriculum. The visitors therefore recommend that, if changes have been made to the curriculum of the programme, they should engage 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	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Brooks University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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
- Service user and carer strategy

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

At the annual monitoring day the visitors were made aware that the education provider had made changes to the curriculum of the FdSc Paramedic Science programme which were highlighted via the annual monitoring process. The visitors note that the BSc (Hons) programme ran its first cohort in September 2016 and could not see any information about changes to the curriculum. The visitors therefore recommend that, if changes have been made to the curriculum of the programme, they should engage 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	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Brooks University
Programme title	Independent Prescribing (conversion course) for Allied Health Professions: (PG Level 7)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Independent prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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
 - Service user and carer strategy

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Brooks University
Programme title	Independent / Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professions (v300) Level 6
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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
 - Service user and carer strategy

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Brooks University
Programme title	Independent / Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professions (v300) PG level 7
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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
 - Service user and carer strategy

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers 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

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	FdSc Paramedic Emergency Care
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser) John Donaghy (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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
 - Service user policy
 - Service user and carer involvement strategy
 - Clinical Examination and Paramedic Intervention Skills Module descriptor
 - Minor change to modules document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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 documentation, the visitors noted in the external examiner's response for 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 that there is plan to recruit a number of staff members due to high staff turnover. This was mentioned in both responses, however, from the documentation provided the visitors could not see whether these staff members have been recruited, evidence of any formal processes there were in place to ensure the recruitment of these staff members and whether these recruited staff members are appropriately qualified and experienced to deliver an effective programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of staff members to effectively deliver this programme and that they are appropriately experienced and qualified.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the module descriptor (U43333) that the education provider has made changes to the assessment methods. The visitors reviewed the module descriptor and saw that the "three hour written test, Essay and Two OSCE exams will be replaced by assessed online discussions and at least four workshops". Firstly, the visitors were unsure as to what the proposed "assessed online discussions and workshops" would entail, therefore they were unclear as to whether the proposed assessment methods were appropriate to replace the current assessment methods. The visitors were unable to determine whether the changes to the assessment methods is appropriate to measure the learning outcomes, and therefore the achievement of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence clarifying the proposed assessment methods, how they measure the assessment of the learning outcomes, and how they are appropriate to measure the learning outcomes.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Tracey Clephan (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
 - Evidence for service user involvement

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

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Lincoln Simmons (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
 - Service users and carers advisory group meeting
 - Service users and advisory group leaflet

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

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme title	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Bevan (Operating department practitioner) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	19 April 2017

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 programme review document
 - Documentation for SET 3.17
 - Value based recruitment document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Packwood (Practitioner psychologist) Antony Ward (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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 did not see evidence of involvement of service users and carers on the programme, but they are satisfied that this is appropriate as the programme is closing in three months' time and currently has only two students who are both graduating in July 2017. This will be the programme's final graduation. The programme has not had a student intake since 2010. Approval for further cohorts was withdrawn in 2012.

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 visitor	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen's University of Belfast
Programme title	Doctorate in Educational, Child and Adolescent Psychology (DECAP)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
 - Business Case Addendum letter
 - Documentation to evidence service user and carer involvement
 - Information about staff development
 - Information about physical resources
 - Curriculum timetables / year overviews
 - Information relating to the revised HCPC standards of conduct performance and ethics

- Placement documentation
- Information relating to assessment moderation

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 visitor

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen's University of Belfast
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsych)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James McManus (Practitioner psychologist) Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
 - Terms and conditions of employment
 - Job details
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Programme regulations
 - Fitness to practice guidelines

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Reading
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - Annex 1 E mails from medical external examiner
 - Appendix 1 PI1C1 Introduction to Clinical Studies seminar schedule Summer term
 - Appendix 2 PL2C11 Communication Impairment I -fluency course outline 2015
 - Appendix 3 21/04/16 Expert by Experience- Minutes of meeting
 - Appendix 4 Service User Panel Policy
 - Appendix 5 29/9/16 Expert by Experience panel- Minutes of Meeting
 - Appendix 6 PI1C1 feedback from meet the carers

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

Name of education provider	Ruskin College
Name of validating body	The Open University
Programme title	BA (Honours) Social work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Blythe (Social worker in England) Patricia Higham (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	27 February 2017

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
 - Statistical data about students

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the assessment documentation and admissions process that there was information regarding how the service users and carers are involved in the programme. However the visitors did not receive any information about how service users and carers were appropriately supported and trained for the programme. The visitors were therefore unsure about how the education provider ensures that the service users and carers are given the appropriate tools to be involved in the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate what support and training is available to service users and carers.

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

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Integrated Practice Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England) Kate Johnson (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	13 March 2017

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
- Guidance notes for practice learning and Practice Assessment Documentation for students and mentors/practice educators
- Service User Consultation documents
- Law and Social Policy in Health and Wellbeing module timetable
- Foundations in nursing and social work timetable
- Supporting People in Community Employment (SPICE) documents

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: From the information provided the visitors noted that the education provider has submitted a programme action log as their internal quality report. For the internal quality documents (2014-2015 and 2015-2016) the visitors were presented with a 'programme action log' in the format of a spreadsheet. The visitors recognised that the spreadsheet was used to flag suggested actions for the programme. However, due to the spreadsheet layout, the visitors found the 'programme action log' difficult to navigate through, in particular the 2014-2015 action log. The visitors could not clearly identify each suggested action to any resolution associated with an action. Due to the difficulties the visitors had in assessing the evidence, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider evaluates the programme's effectiveness using the 'programme action log'. The visitors therefore require further clarification on the actions captured in the 'programme action log' and the actions taken to respond to a particular issue, to ensure that the programme has effective and regular monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of the actions captured in the 'programme action log' and the action taken by the education provider.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted in the internal quality monitoring report that due to 'the current context of service provision, a number of placement areas have reduced the number, or stopped providing placements'. From our understanding, the education provider intends to make changes to identify more placements, given the reduction of placement areas currently available. The education provider will need to engage the HCPC through a major change process if this will impact our standards.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dawn Blenkin (Occupational therapist) Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Admissions interview sheet
 - Programme specification
 - Consultation feedback
 - Service user review
 - Module specification
 - Full time timetable
 - Employment assessment and bands
 - All service user areas highlighted in timetables

- Unsolicited service user feedback
- Student feedback
- Impact of service user as reflected in student assessment
- Service user feedback in modules
- Listening event feedback
- Engaging with service user document at various levels
- Programme action log
- School of Health public involvement payments guidance
- Award letter and application

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

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Simon Dykes (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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 response to the external examiner's report is missing because of changes to internal quality assurance at the education provider. However visitors were satisfied that appropriate responding to the 2014-15 report had occurred.

- Evidence relating to service user and carer involvement

- Information about curriculum

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 their review of the external examiners' reports, the visitors noted that there was an issue with a high proportion of students being awarded upper second and first class degrees during both 2014-15 and 2015-16. They considered that this could indicate that the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are failing to ensure appropriate standards in assessment. In their responses to the 2015-16 external examiner's report, the programme team stated that they aware of this issue and had begun a review process into programme marking, alongside escalating the issue to the university level, as the calculation of degree classifications is the responsibility of the university. The visitors were not able to see evidence relating to this review process, and therefore require that such evidence be made available.

Suggested documentation: Evidence demonstrating the progress of the programme team's review process, and evidence demonstrating that this issue has been appropriately escalated to the university by the programme team.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

Having reviewed the education provider's response, the visitors were satisfied that standard 6.6 was met and that the ongoing review of standards of assessment was an appropriate procedure. They would like to highlight this review as something which should be revisited in a future annual monitoring process to ensure that the issues raised have been appropriately addressed. In addition, they would like to remind the education provider that they should contact the HCPC if assessment methods change, so that the HCPC can decide on the best means by which to review such changes.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social worker in England) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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 facilitator guide
 - Examination briefs
 - Introduction to Collaborative Practice module PowerPoint

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to module documentation regarding service user involvement. The visitors noted that there was a role play session in the Introduction to Radiographic Practice II OSCE Examination brief but they were unclear as to whether this was an actual service user involved in the role play or whether it was an actor. The visitors were also unclear about how service users have been involved in other modules, how their involvement is appropriate and how service users are supported and trained to undertake their role on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate how service users are involved in the programme, how this involvement is appropriate, and how service users are supported and trained to undertake their role on 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

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 7)
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - L6 Moderation extended reflection and portfolio
 - L7 Moderation extended reflection and portfolio
 - Moderation reports Jan 2015
 - NMP evaluation
 - Curriculum vitae Liz Grath
 - Service user information
 - Action Plan
 - EE L6 moderation feedback
 - EE L7 moderation feedback

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Podiatric patient survey
 - Staff rooms and service users
 - Level 4 FT PDP
 - Level 5 FT PDP
 - Level 6 FT PDP

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

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	Non Medical Prescribing – Independent Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - L6 Moderation extended reflection and portfolio
 - L7 Moderation extended reflection and portfolio
 - Moderation reports Jan 2015
 - NMP evaluation
 - Curriculum vitae Liz Grath
 - Service user information
 - Action Plan

- EE L6 moderation feedback
- EE L7 moderation feedback

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers 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

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England) Kate Johnson (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	13 March 2017

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 action log
- Service user and carer involvement documentation
- 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.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that there are three external examiners for the programme. The visitors noted that several external examiners reports and responses were not submitted as part of the annual monitoring submission. The 2015-2016 academic year external reports and 2014-2015 responses for two of the external examiners were not submitted and both external examiner responses for one external examiner was not submitted. As such the visitors could not assess whether there have been suggestions of monitoring and evaluation of the programme. The education provider did not submit a full submission of their monitoring and evaluation documentation and therefore the visitors could not determine whether there are appropriate monitoring and evaluation systems in place to ensure the programme's effectiveness. The visitors will therefore need to see evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that there are effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place to effectively deliver the programme including the missing external examiners' reports and the responses.

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

Reason: From the information provided the visitors noted that the education provider has submitted a programme action log as their internal quality report. For the internal quality documents (2014-2015 and 2015-2016) the visitors were presented with a 'programme action log' in the format of a spreadsheet. The visitors recognised that the spreadsheet was used to flag suggested actions for the programme. However, due to the spreadsheet layout, the visitors found the 'programme action log' difficult to navigate through. The visitors could not clearly identify each suggested action to any resolution associated with an action. Due to the difficulties the visitors had in assessing the evidence, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider evaluates the programme's effectiveness using the 'programme action log'. The visitors therefore require further clarification on the actions captured in the 'programme action log' and the actions taken to respond to a particular issue, to ensure that the programme has effective and regular monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of the actions captured in the 'programme action log' and the action taken by the education provider.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 6)
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - L6 Moderation extended reflection and portfolio
 - L7 Moderation extended reflection and portfolio
 - Moderation reports Jan 2015
 - NMP evaluation
 - Curriculum vitae Liz Grath
 - Service user information
 - Action Plan
 - EE L6 moderation feedback
 - EE L7 moderation feedback

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	MSc Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Podiatric patient survey
 - Podiatric user group interviews
 - HCPC programme review SET 3.17
 - MS – Core Proficiencies in Clinical Practice
 - Year 1 PDP user assessment

- Master induction timetable
- ICPP Person centred care
- ICPP week 5
- Staff rooms and service users

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

Name of education provider	St George's, University of London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Graham Noyce (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Service user interview allocations
 - Student progress and monitoring committee agendas
 - Timetables indicating teaching from service users
 - Inter-professional Foundation Learning case studies

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

Name of education provider	St George's, University of London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
 - Application of skill module change form
 - Programme specification
 - BSc Therapeutic radiography PS 2016 intake
 - Module guiden year 1
 - Module guide year 2
 - Service User interview allocations
 - Service user weblinks document

- Year 1 Assessment Scheme new degree
- Year 2 Assessment Scheme new degree case analysis
- Year 3 Assessment Scheme new degree
- Module Descriptor

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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 content that the evidence provided demonstrated that the standards continue to be met. However, the visitors noted instances of reading lists that included out of date HCPC documentation. For example in the programme specification 2016-2017, the HCPC standards of proficiency document was dated 2009. The current version of the document is 2013. The visitors recommend that the programme team review the reading lists to ensure that the correct editions of texts are detailed to students.

The visitors also noted that there had been a change in weightings in the module descriptors for the programme. However the assessment scheme submitted reflects the previous module scheme of assessment appendix one. Again the visitors suggest these documents are revised to ensure clarity for students.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	St George's, University of London
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing Health Professions Council (HPC) Members Level 6
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Email from Anne-Marie Hassenkamp

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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.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 a relevant part of the HCPC Register.

Reason: As part of the audit form and supporting documentation, the visitors noted that there has been a change in module leadership for the programme from Ahmed Younis to Anne-Marie Hassenkamp. The visitors could not determine if this meant that Anne-Marie Hassenkamp is the named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme. Therefore the visitors require clarification of who has professional responsibility of the programme. In addition to this, if that person is now Anne-Marie Hassenkamp, evidence that demonstrates that Anne-Marie Hassenkamp is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are made, be on the relevant part of the HCPC Register is required.

Suggested documentation: Documentation to clarify who has professional responsibility over the programme, and if there has been a change, evidence that demonstrates that the person is suitable and appropriately qualified to fulfil the post in line with the standard.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: When considering the audit the visitors noted that the education provider will be recruiting a project manager to consider how service users and carers can be involved in the programme for academic year 2016-17, however there was no evidence to demonstrate how the involvement has been implemented. Therefore the visitors could not determine that that service users and carers are currently involved in the programme. The visitors note that the education provider is required to demonstrate how they involve service users and carers as part of this audit in 2016-17. Therefore the visitors require additional evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are being involved in 2016-17 academic year.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how service users and carers are currently involved in 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers 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 B.15 standard was met, and that service users and carers were involved in the programme. However, they suggest that in future evidence submissions the education provider may wish to review how it presents the detail of the service users and carers' involvement, with a view to clarifying the exact nature of this involvement and how they are trained and supported. In this way the education provider can help future reviewers to understand their work in this area and so help visitors be confident that the standard continues to be met.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	St George's, University of London
Programme title	Foundation Science Degree in Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Sara Smith (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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

Name of education provider	St George's, University of London
Programme title	PG Practice Cert in Supplementary Prescribing (Health Professions Council (HPC) members) Level 7
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
- Email from Anne-Marie Hassenkamp

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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.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 a relevant part of the HCPC Register.

Reason: As part of the audit form and supporting documentation, the visitors noted that there has been a change in module leadership for the programme from Ahmed Younis to Anne-Marie Hassenkamp. The visitors could not determine if this meant that Anne-Marie Hassenkamp is the named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme. Therefore the visitors require clarification of who has professional responsibility of the programme. In addition to this, if that person is now Anne-Marie Hassenkamp, evidence that demonstrates that Anne-Marie Hassenkamp is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are made, be on the relevant part of the HCPC Register is required.

Suggested documentation: Documentation to clarify who has professional responsibility over the programme, and if there has been a change, evidence that demonstrates that the person is suitable and appropriately qualified to fulfil the post in line with the standard.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: When considering the audit the visitors noted that the education provider will be recruiting a project manager to consider how service users and carers can be involved in the programme for academic year 2016-17, however there was no evidence to demonstrate how the involvement has been implemented. Therefore the visitors could not determine that that service users and carers are currently involved in the programme. The visitors note that the education provider is required to demonstrate how they involve service users and carers as part of this audit in 2016-17. Therefore the visitors require additional evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are being involved in 2016-17 academic year.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how service users and carers are currently involved in 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers 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 B.15 standard was met, and that service users and carers were involved in the programme. However, they suggest that in future evidence submissions the education provider may wish to review how it presents the detail of the service users and carers' involvement, with a view to clarifying the exact nature of this involvement and how they are trained and supported. In this way the education provider can help future reviewers to understand their work in this area and so help visitors be confident that the standard continues to be met.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	St George's, University of London
Programme title	Prescribing: Independent and Supplementary
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
- Email from Anne-Marie Hassenkamp

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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.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 a relevant part of the HCPC Register.

Reason: As part of the audit form and supporting documentation, the visitors noted that there has been a change in module leadership for the programme from Ahmed Younis to Anne-Marie Hassenkamp. The visitors could not determine if this meant that Anne-Marie Hassenkamp is the named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme. Therefore the visitors require clarification of who has professional responsibility of the programme. In addition to this, if that person is now Anne-Marie Hassenkamp, evidence that demonstrates that Anne-Marie Hassenkamp is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are made, be on the relevant part of the HCPC Register is required.

Suggested documentation: Documentation to clarify who has professional responsibility over the programme, and if there has been a change, evidence that demonstrates that the person is suitable and appropriately qualified to fulfil the post in line with the standard.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: When considering the audit the visitors noted that the education provider will be recruiting a project manager to consider how service users and carers can be involved in the programme for academic year 2016-17, however there was no evidence to demonstrate how the involvement has been implemented. Therefore the visitors could not determine that that service users and carers are currently involved in the programme. The visitors note that the education provider is required to demonstrate how they involve service users and carers as part of this audit in 2016-17. Therefore the visitors require additional evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are being involved in 2016-17 academic year.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how service users and carers are currently involved in 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers 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 B.15 standard was met, and that service users and carers were involved in the programme. However, they suggest that in future evidence submissions the education provider may wish to review how it presents the detail of the service users and carers' involvement, with a view to clarifying the exact nature of this involvement and how they are trained and supported. In this way the education provider can help future reviewers to understand their work in this area and so help visitors be confident that the standard continues to be met.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sheffield
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James McManus (Practitioner psychologist) Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
 - Service user and carer documentation
 - Role play guidance
 - E-Portfolio

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

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	27 February 2017

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
 - Information to support the change in person with overall professional responsibility for the programme
 - Documentation to support service user and carer involvement

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: From reviewing the documentation, the visitors noted that since the 2012-13 academic year, there appear to have been four different programme leaders across the physiotherapy provision. There is limited information in the submission regarding the changes to leadership for the programmes, and the HCPC have not always been informed of these changes in a timely manner. The visitors are unclear how the education provider has managed any impact that may have been caused by regular changes to the programme leader.

Suggested documentation: Information that demonstrates how the education provider has ensured, and will ensure that the programme continues to be managed effectively.

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: The visitors noted that there has been a change to the programme leader to Peter White from January 2017. From reviewing the documentation provided, specifically the new programme leader's CV, the visitors noted that they are primarily experienced in research, with more limited experience in teaching across the curriculum. The visitors also noted that the new programme leader has led a post registration programme at the education provider. However, the visitors were unclear how the new programme leader's previous teaching and academic leadership responsibilities noted through their CV demonstrate that they are appropriately qualified and experienced to lead a pre-registration programme. For example, the visitors were unclear whether they hold a teaching qualification, or how they would be supported in undertaking the role.

Suggested documentation: Further information which demonstrates that the new programme leader is appropriately qualified and experienced to lead the programme, including information about how they will be supported.

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 comments in the internal quality monitoring documentation that the programme "continues to rely on a limited number of academic staff to deliver three pathways in physiotherapy; this can create challenges in meeting the needs of each pathway and specific student's needs at times". From the information provided, it is not clear whether the overall number of staff and / or the staff profile has changed. Therefore, the visitors are unclear how the education provider ensure that there is an adequate

number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme, and therefore how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Information that clearly defines the current staff profile and level, along with information that demonstrates how the programme continues to meet this standard if any changes have been made.

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 there have been significant changes to staff, including four different programme leaders, since the 2012-13 academic year. Therefore, the education provider should continue to monitor changes to the staff profile to ensure the staff team has the required breadth of knowledge to deliver an effective programme. The education provider should also report any significant staff changes to the HCPC at the earliest opportunity, so that we can make a judgement that our standards around staffing are met by 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

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	27 February 2017

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
- Information to support the change in person with overall professional responsibility for the programme
- Documentation to support service user and carer involvement

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: From reviewing the documentation, the visitors noted that since the 2012-13 academic year, there appear to have been four different programme leaders across the physiotherapy provision. There is limited information in the submission regarding the changes to leadership for the programmes, and the HCPC have not always been informed of these changes in a timely manner. The visitors are unclear how the education provider has managed any impact that may have been caused by regular changes to the programme leader.

Suggested documentation: Information that demonstrates how the education provider has ensured, and will ensure that the programme continues to be managed effectively.

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: The visitors noted that there has been a change to the programme leader to Peter White from January 2017. From reviewing the documentation provided, specifically the new programme leader's CV, the visitors noted that they are primarily experienced in research, with more limited experience in teaching across the curriculum. The visitors also noted that the new programme leader has led a post registration programme at the education provider. However, the visitors were unclear how the new programme leader's previous teaching and academic leadership responsibilities noted through their CV demonstrate that they are appropriately qualified and experienced to lead a pre-registration programme. For example, the visitors were unclear whether they hold a teaching qualification, or how they would be supported in undertaking the role.

Suggested documentation: Further information which demonstrates that the new programme leader is appropriately qualified and experienced to lead the programme, including information about how they will be supported.

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 comments in the internal quality monitoring documentation that the programme "continues to rely on a limited number of academic staff to deliver three pathways in physiotherapy; this can create challenges in meeting the needs of each pathway and specific student's needs at times". From the information provided, it is not clear whether the overall number of staff and / or the staff profile has changed. Therefore, the visitors are unclear how the education provider ensure that there is an adequate

number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme, and therefore how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Information that clearly defines the current staff profile and level, along with information that demonstrates how the programme continues to meet this standard if any changes have been made.

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 there have been significant changes to staff, including four different programme leaders, since the 2012-13 academic year. Therefore, the education provider should continue to monitor changes to the staff profile to ensure the staff team has the required breadth of knowledge to deliver an effective programme. The education provider should also report any significant staff changes to the HCPC at the earliest opportunity, so that we can make a judgement that our standards around staffing are met by 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

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	27 February 2017

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
- Information to support the change in person with overall professional responsibility for the programme
- Documentation to support service user and carer involvement

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: From reviewing the documentation, the visitors noted that since the 2012-13 academic year, there appear to have been four different programme leaders across the physiotherapy provision. There is limited information in the submission regarding the changes to leadership for the programmes, and the HCPC have not always been informed of these changes in a timely manner. The visitors are unclear how the education provider has managed any impact that may have been caused by regular changes to the programme leader.

Suggested documentation: Information that demonstrates how the education provider has ensured, and will ensure that the programme continues to be managed effectively.

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: The visitors noted that there has been a change to the programme leader to Peter White from January 2017. From reviewing the documentation provided, specifically the new programme leader's CV, the visitors noted that they are primarily experienced in research, with more limited experience in teaching across the curriculum. The visitors also noted that the new programme leader has led a post registration programme at the education provider. However, the visitors were unclear how the new programme leader's previous teaching and academic leadership responsibilities noted through their CV demonstrate that they are appropriately qualified and experienced to lead a pre-registration programme. For example, the visitors were unclear whether they hold a teaching qualification, or how they would be supported in undertaking the role.

Suggested documentation: Further information which demonstrates that the new programme leader is appropriately qualified and experienced to lead the programme, including information about how they will be supported.

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 comments in the internal quality monitoring documentation that the programme "continues to rely on a limited number of academic staff to deliver three pathways in physiotherapy; this can create challenges in meeting the needs of each pathway and specific student's needs at times". From the information provided, it is not clear whether the overall number of staff and / or the staff profile has changed. Therefore, the visitors are unclear how the education provider ensure that there is an adequate

number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme, and therefore how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Information that clearly defines the current staff profile and level, along with information that demonstrates how the programme continues to meet this standard if any changes have been made.

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 there have been significant changes to staff, including four different programme leaders, since the 2012-13 academic year. Therefore, the education provider should continue to monitor changes to the staff profile to ensure the staff team has the required breadth of knowledge to deliver an effective programme. The education provider should also report any significant staff changes to the HCPC at the earliest opportunity, so that we can make a judgement that our standards around staffing are met by 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

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	Health Psychology Research and Professional Practice (PhD)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	16 February 2017

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 leader curriculum vitae

A response to external examiner's report is not included because this is done on an individual basis not an overall programme.

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors in their reading could not see any direct evidence of the how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The education provider said in the audit document that trainees in their “generic professional competence” provide a report on service user involvement in their training. However no other evidence that service users and carers are involved in the programme was provided. The visitors could not see where and how service users are involved in this programme. Therefore the visitors require evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in 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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors were content that the programme continues to be met, they would advise the education provider should ensure that all trainees' names are redacted from documentation to ensure that the trainees are protected.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	Hearing Aid Aptitude Test
Mode of delivery	Distance learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser) John Donaghy (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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
 - Service user involvement strategy

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser) John Donaghy (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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
- Introduction to clinical placements module descriptors
- Programme specification
- Staff curriculum vitae
- IRCP descriptions 2016-2017
- Lines of responsibility for Audiology programmes
- Service User Involvement Strategy 2016- 2017 documents
- Admissions process documents

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 internal quality report for 2015-2016 that the education provider has mentioned that there are "significant challenges" with future placement capacity. The education provider has mentioned that they will be expanding their "placement capacity outside the previous patch". Once documentation is available to support how the education provider will ensure that there are sufficient future placements for students. The education provider will need to inform the HCPC through a major change notification form as this may affect our standards about practice placements.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	Health Psychology Research and Professional Practice (MPhil)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	16 February 2017

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 leader curriculum vitae

A response to external examiner's report is not included because this is done on an individual basis not an overall programme.

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors in their reading could not see any direct evidence of the how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The education provider said in the audit document that trainees in their “generic professional competence” provide a report on service user involvement in their training. However no other evidence that service users and carers are involved in the programme was provided. The visitors could not see where and how service users are involved in this programme. Therefore the visitors require evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in 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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors were content that the programme continues to be met, they would advise the education provider should ensure that all trainees names are redacted from documentation to ensure that the trainees are protected.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	Msci Healthcare Science (Audiology)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser) John Donaghy (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	27 March 2017

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
- Introduction to clinical placements module descriptors
- Programme specification
- Staff curriculum vitae
- IRCP descriptions 2016-2017
- Lines of responsibility for Audiology programmes
- Service User Involvement Strategy 2016- 2017 documents
- Admissions process documents

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 internal quality report for 2015-2016 that the education provider has mentioned that there are "significant challenges" with future placement capacity. The education provider has mentioned that they will be expanding their "placement capacity outside the previous patch". Once documentation is available to support how the education provider will ensure that there are sufficient future placements for students. The education provider will need to inform the HCPC through a major change notification form as this may affect our standards about practice placements.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Staffordshire University
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Packwood (Practitioner psychologist) Antony Ward (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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

Name of education provider	Staffordshire University
Programme title	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Ruth Baker (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Curriculum Steering Group for Operating Department Practice
 - Practice placement operating meeting

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

Name of education provider	Staffordshire University
Programme title	Independent/Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber) Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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 Timetable V300
 - V300 Competency Handbook 2016
 - 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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: When reviewing the audit documentation the visitors noted that there is a session run on the perspective of a service user delivered by an individual who was not on the staff list. However the visitors could not determine from the evidence provided who this individual is, whether they are a service user and carer, or a representative of service users and carers, or a member of staff. Therefore the visitors require clarification about who the individual is and, if they are a service user, the visitors require further information about their involvement on the programme.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that clarifies whether or not the individual is a service user, and documentation that clarifies their involvement in the session, such as a session plan.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Surrey
Programme title	Practitioner Doctorate in Psychotherapeutic and Counselling Psychology (PsychD)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Counselling psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Packwood (Counselling psychologist) Antony Ward (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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

Name of education provider	University of Surrey
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Nutrition/Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Tracy Clephan (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
 - Multiple Mini Interviews presentation
 - National student survey 2013- 2016
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Service user and carer involvement document
 - Module descriptors
 - Student timetable
 - Annual Student Training Forum Programme 2016
 - Placement Provider training
 - Undergraduate Nutrition review meeting minutes

- British Dietetic Association (BDA) accreditation (2014-2015 and 2015-2016)
- Local education & training boards Annual reports (2014-2015 and 2015-2016)

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

Name of education provider	University of Surrey
Programme title	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Lincoln Simmons (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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 team meeting (PMT) minutes
 - School service users and carers group terms of reference
 - Comments from Service user group 28-6-16
 - Service Users and Carers Group in Integrated Care meeting notes 09-16
 - Caring conference flyer
 - Concepts of caring module timetable

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

Name of education provider	Swansea University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of postal review	3 April 2017

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
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Interview schedule
 - Service user and carer strategy
 - Service user involvement timetables
 - Role description for strategic lead for service user and carer involvement
 - Information about service user involvement award

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

Name of education provider	Swansea University
Programme title	Diploma Higher Education Paramedic Science for Emergency Medical Technicians
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Sara Smith (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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 visitor	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University College London
Programme title	D.Ed.Psy Educational and Child Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
- Documentation relating to service user and carer involvement
- Updated placement documentation
- Placement quality assurance documentation
- Updated teaching materials
- Board of Examiner meeting minutes

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 visitor

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Radiographer) Graham Noyce (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Service users and carers strategy
 - Verbal reasoning test
 - Declaration of suitability for social work
 - Module descriptor

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk
Programme title	Non-Medical Independent and/or Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Supporting documentation

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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: When reviewing the audit documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider has recruited three new members of staff who have replaced previous staff, however the education provider did not provide any evidence to demonstrate the qualifications, experience and registration of the new members of staff. Although the same number of teaching staff for the programme has been maintained, without information about their qualifications and experience the visitors could not determine that there is an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. Therefore further evidence is required to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates the qualifications, experience and registration of the new members of teaching staff, such as curriculum vitae.

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: When reviewing the audit documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider has recruited three new members of staff, however the education provider did not provide any evidence to demonstrate that the new members of staff have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to teach the subject areas. Without this information the visitors could not determine that the subject areas will continue to be taught by staff with the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. Therefore the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate that with the new members of staff in place, the subject areas will continue to be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates that with the addition of the new members of staff, the subject areas will continue to be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge, such as curriculum vitae.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: When reviewing the audit documentation, the visitors were directed to the University of Suffolk service user strategy as evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme. However this specific document was not provided as part of the audit. Therefore the visitors could not determine how service users and carers are involved in the programme. In addition the visitors could not determine how a university wide service user and carer policy will be applied to this programme to ensure that the involvement is appropriate and beneficial. Therefore the visitors require the

university wide policy and evidence to demonstrate how the policy has been implemented to this programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the university wide policy for service users and carers has been applied to this programme ensuring that service users and carers are involved in 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers 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

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk
Programme title	Non-Medical Independent and/or Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Supporting documentation

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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: When reviewing the audit documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider has recruited three new members of staff who have replaced previous staff, however the education provider did not provide any evidence to demonstrate the qualifications, experience and registration of the new members of staff. Although the same number of teaching staff for the programme has been maintained, without information about their qualifications and experience the visitors could not determine that there is an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. Therefore further evidence is required to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates the qualifications, experience and registration of the new members of teaching staff, such as curriculum vitae.

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: When reviewing the audit documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider has recruited three new members of staff, however the education provider did not provide any evidence to demonstrate that the new members of staff have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to teach the subject areas. Without this information the visitors could not determine that the subject areas will continue to be taught by staff with the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. Therefore the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate that with the new members of staff in place, the subject areas will continue to be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates that with the addition of the new members of staff, the subject areas will continue to be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge, such as curriculum vitae.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: When reviewing the audit documentation, the visitors were directed to the University of Suffolk service user strategy as evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme. However this specific document was not provided as part of the audit. Therefore the visitors could not determine how service users and carers are involved in the programme. In addition the visitors could not determine how a university wide service user and carer policy will be applied to this programme to ensure that the involvement is appropriate and beneficial. Therefore the visitors require the

university wide policy and evidence to demonstrate how the policy has been implemented to this programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the university wide policy for service users and carers has been applied to this programme ensuring that service users and carers are involved in 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
 - Definitive document;
 - Standards of proficiency mapping document;
 - Course Handbook;
 - Sample Practice Assessment Document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk
Programme title	Non-Medical Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - DMP handbook
 - Level 7 Course Handbook
 - Level 7 Portfolio
 - Course Information Document

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: When reviewing the audit documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider has recruited three new members of staff who have replaced previous staff, however the education provider did not provide any evidence to demonstrate the qualifications, experience and registration of the new members of staff. Although the same number of teaching staff for the programme has been maintained, without information about their qualifications and experience the visitors could not determine that there is an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. Therefore further evidence is required to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates the qualifications, experience and registration of the new members of teaching staff, such as curriculum vitae.

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: When reviewing the audit documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider has recruited three new members of staff, however the education provider did not provide any evidence to demonstrate that the new members of staff have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to teach the subject areas. Without this information the visitors could not determine that the subject areas will continue to be taught by staff with the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. Therefore the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate that with the new members of staff in place, the subject areas will continue to be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates that with the addition of the new members of staff, the subject areas will continue to be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge, such as curriculum vitae.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: When reviewing the audit documentation, the visitors were directed to the University of Suffolk service user strategy as evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme. However this specific document was not provided as part of the audit. Therefore the visitors could not determine how service users and carers are involved in the programme. In addition the visitors could not determine how a university wide service user and carer policy will be applied to this programme to ensure that the involvement is appropriate and beneficial. Therefore the visitors require the

university wide policy and evidence to demonstrate how the policy has been implemented to this programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the university wide policy for service users and carers has been applied to this programme ensuring that service users and carers are involved in 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers 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

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social worker in England) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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 committee meeting minutes
 - Programme handbook
 - Re-approval document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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 evidence has been mapped and provided for standards where there has been no change. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that evidence only needs to be mapped and provided for the last two academic years prior to the annual monitoring audit where there has been a change to how the programme meets the standard.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Ruth Baker (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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
 - Change to Practice Assessment Document (CAT3625)
 - Service user involvement evidence
 - Practice Assessment Document (PAD) mapping 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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors' noted in the documentation that as part of the submission to support service user and carer involvement, the education provider submitted some information regarding the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme. The visitors recommend that the education provider sends information regarding the programme being reviewed, to support the standards.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme title	BA (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Michael Branicki (Social worker in England) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
- Staff Student Liason Committee minutes and staff responses)
- Reports on the Work of Service Users and Carers 2015-2016 and 2014-15
- School of Social Work Suitability and Fitness to Practise Policy
- Quality Assurance of Practice Learning (QAPL) documents
- Other school documents covering enhancements since the approval visit

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 on reviewing the comprehensive documentation submitted for this audit wished to remind the education provider that it should ensure that that documentation provided is relevant to those documents asked for at the time of the audit request from the HCPC. The documentation provided should reflect any changes to the programme that could impact on the standards.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James McManus (Practitioner psychologist) Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
 - New staff curriculum vitae and staffing evidence
 - Experts by experience evidence
 - International experiential placement component evidence

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

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme title	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Michael Branicki (Social worker in England) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
- Staff Student Liason Committee minutes and staff responses)
- Reports on the Work of Service Users and Carers 2015-2016 and 2014-15
- School of Social Work Suitability and Fitness to Practise Policy
- Quality Assurance of Practice Learning (QAPL) documents
- Other school documents covering enhancements since the approval visit

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 on reviewing the comprehensive documentation submitted for this audit wished to remind the education provider that it should ensure that that documentation provided is relevant to those documents asked for at the time of the audit request from the HCPC. The documentation provided should reflect any changes to the programme that could impact on the standards.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme title	PG Dip Mental Health (incorporating AMHP) Higher Specialist Award
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Lynda Kelly (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - School of Social Work Policies and Documents
 - Course Information and Review documents
 - Teaching documents
 - Quality Assurance of Practice Learning documents
 - UEA Policy Documents
 - 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme title	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Ruth Baker (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the audit form that the education provider has mapped no changes to the service user and carer involvement standard. The education provider has stated in the audit form that they meet this standard by involving service users and carers in 'course committees, curriculum development and recruitment/admission processes as part of School Service User strategy'. However, the visitors did not receive any evidence to support how service users and carers are involved in this programme and the education provider has not submitted any evidence in the past to support this standard. The visitors could therefore not determine how service users are involved in the programme, how their involvement is appropriate for this programme, how they are trained and how they are supported. As such, the visitors require further evidence in order to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Further information about how service users and carers are involved in the programme, how their involvement is appropriate for this programme, how they are trained and how they are supported.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East London
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James McManus (Clinical psychologist) Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
 - A copy of the programme's 2016 newsletter
 - Service user and carer involvement evidence
 - Programme committee agenda
 - List of teaching sessions
 - Selection sub-committee minutes
 - People's committee selection rating 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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the evidence provided that service users and carers are involved in a number of ways on the programme such as selection and teaching. However, the visitors did not see any evidence to demonstrate that service users and carers are appropriately prepared and supported to undertake these roles. As such, they require further evidence that this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence and information about how service users and carers are prepared and supported to undertake their roles on 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 visitor	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East London
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology (D.Ed.Ch.Psych)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
 - Documentation relating to changes to reporting of the placement activities
 - Module handbooks

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

Name of education provider	University of East London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	27 February 2017

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
 - Documentation to support how the programme meets SET 3.17

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In order to demonstrate how this standard is met, the education provider supplied reflections from a service user on podiatry student interviews, along with a module guide intended to show integration of service users and service partners in the teaching of students. However, from the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine who service users and carers are for the physiotherapy programme, how the education provider determines appropriate involvement of these individuals, or how service users and carers are supported in their role(s). Therefore, the visitors require further information to demonstrate how this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Information that demonstrates how service users and carers are embedded in the programme, along with information about how they are supported.

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

On reviewing the additional evidence provided by the education provider to support how the programme meets SET 3.17, the visitors were satisfied that this standard is met at a threshold level. However, the visitors noted that service users and carers are involved in a limited way, and that the education provider should consider involving them further in other aspects of the programme. This will help to fully embed service users and carers in the

programme, and to ensure that their involvement is more equitable to other similar professional programmes.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Ball (Therapeutic radiographer) Lucy Myers (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
 - Values based recruitment presentation
 - Programme specification
 - Algorithm for public involvement in DAHP
 - Examples of service user involvement
 - Example scheme of work
 - Validation presentation

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the education provider has submitted external examiner reports and internal quality reports for 2013-14. The visitors wish to remind the education provider that they only need to submit documents for the last two academic years for an annual monitoring audit (which is 2014-15 and 2015-16 for annual monitoring in 2016-17).

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Health Psychology (Professional Practice)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	20 February 2017

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
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Module descriptors
 - Programme handbook
 - Student/ staff meeting minutes

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.

3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Reason: The visitors noted in the 2014-2015 programme monitoring report that “administration around registration and reregistration is an ongoing problem”. The programme manager invited admissions staff to induction meetings to help with the registration process. However, in the student representative minutes for November 2015, the visitors noted that there are still ongoing issues with the majority of students still experiencing issues around registration. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates that there is a process in place to deal with the registration problems for the programme to be assured that the system of academic and pastoral student support is in place.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates that the student registration problems have been resolved or an action plan to demonstrate how the education provider will deal with this issue.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors, from their reading of the documentation provided, could not see how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The standards mapping document refers to the minutes of the staff student meetings and the consultancy module information, but neither document detailed how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

The visitors could see that the consultancy module allowed students to undertake a piece of work external to their normal place of work so there is collaboration in the work the students do. However there was no clear indication of service user and carers are involved in the programme or how they are supported and trained in the role of service user and carer for the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further documentation that demonstrates the level of involvement of service users and carers on the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates the level of involvement and support for service users in the programme including justification as to why this involvement is appropriate as well as how they are trained and supported in this role

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

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	MA Music Therapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Music therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Phoene Cave (Music therapist) Donald Wetherick (Music therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	8 February 2017

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
 - Final programme handbook
 - Placement supervisor appraisee report form
 - Professional practice 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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme involves service users and carers in the teaching, and has provision for service user and carer feedback to contribute to assessment. The programme team have also indicated that additional input from a service user is now included at induction for the programme. Students are also “encouraged” to attend a choir for participants with aphasia and engage with service users. However, the documentation provided did not explain the content of service user and carer input, and how it is appropriate to the programme. There was also no information about how this involvement is planned, monitored and evaluated. The documentation did not demonstrate how the service user and carers contribute to the learning outcomes for the delivery of the teaching they participate in, or how the feedback gathered is monitored. Also there is no evidence of how service users and carers are supported and /or trained to carry out their contributions to the programme. Therefore the visitors were unclear as to how this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates the roles the service user and carers perform for the programme, including contributing to specific learning outcomes and assessment on placement, and how the service users and carers are supported in their roles throughout all aspects of the programme where service users and carers participate. Also, evidence that shows how the service user and carer input to the programme is monitored and evaluated.

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 comment on moderation needs to be clearer and more transparency in the 2015- 2016 external examiners report. The visitors noted that the education provider had indicated how it intends to address this issue during the 2016-2017 academic session, and were therefore satisfied that the assessment standards continue to be met. The visitors would advise that the education provider keeps the moderation for the modules under review to ensure that they continue to follow the plan they have put in place to ensure that the assessment standards for the programme continue to be met.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	20 February 2017

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
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Module descriptors
 - Programme handbook
 - Student/ staff meeting minutes

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.

3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Reason: The visitors noted in the 2014-2015 programme monitoring report that “administration around registration and reregistration is an ongoing problem”. The programme manager invited admissions staff to induction meetings to help with the registration process. However, in the student representative minutes for November 2015, the visitors noted that there are still ongoing issues with the majority of students still experiencing issues around registration. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates that there is a process in place to deal with the registration problems for the programme to be assured that the system of academic and pastoral student support is in place.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates that the student registration problems have been resolved or an action plan to demonstrate how the education provider will deal with this issue.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors, from their reading of the documentation provided, could not see how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The standards mapping document refers to the minutes of the staff student meetings and the consultancy module information, but neither document detailed how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

The visitors could see that the consultancy module allowed students to undertake a piece of work external to their normal place of work so there is collaboration in the work the students do. However there was no clear indication of service user and carers are involved in the programme or how they are supported and trained in the role of service user and carer for the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further documentation that demonstrates the level of involvement of service users and carers on the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates the level of involvement and support for service users in the programme including justification as to why this involvement is appropriate as well as how they are trained and supported in this role

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Counselling psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Practitioner psychologist) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	MSc Radiotherapy & Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Ball (Therapeutic radiographer) Lucy Myers (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
 - Value based recruitment PowerPoint slides
 - DAHP algorithm of involvement
 - Service user involvement information
 - Example scheme of work
 - Student feedback on learning disabilities lecture
 - Validation presentation

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the education provider has submitted external examiner reports and internal quality reports for 2013-14. The visitors wish to remind the education provider that they only need to submit documents for the last two academic years for an annual monitoring audit (which is 2014-15 and 2015-16 for annual monitoring in 2016-17).

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of West London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Lincoln Simmons (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	29 March 2017

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
 - College of Nursing, Midwifery and Healthcare, Service user and carer involvement strategy, 2013-2017

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: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the external examiner's report, and response, for the 2014-15 academic year did not relate to this programme and instead related to the DipHE Operating Department Practice programme. Because of this the visitors could not determine what regular monitoring and evaluation systems were applied to this programme in the 2014-15 academic year and how it has continued to meet this standard over the past two academic years. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of what regular monitoring and evaluation systems were in place for this programme in 2014-15, what outcomes these systems generated and what responses the programme team provided, if any were required.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence of the regular monitoring and evaluation system that was in place for this programme in the 2014-15 academic year, evidence of what the outcomes were from this monitoring and evidence of what, if any, changes were made as a result of the monitoring.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted, in the audit documentation provided, a service user and carer involvement strategy for the years 2013-2017 which was developed for the College of nursing, midwifery and healthcare. In looking at the audit form and standards mapping document the visitors also noted that the programme team had stated that service users and carers were involved in the programme. However, from the evidence provided, the visitors could not determine how service users and carers were being involved in this programme. In particular the visitors could not see who had been chosen to be involved in the programme, why they had been chosen or why their involvement was appropriate for this BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice. Therefore the visitors require further evidence about the involvement of service users and carers in this programme, how they are identified and involved as well as how this involvement is appropriate for this programme. The visitors also require further evidence as to how those service users and carers chosen to be involved in the programme are supported by the programme team to fulfil the appropriate involvement.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence of service user and carer involvement in this programme, the rationale for this involvement and how the particular service users and carers are chosen (and supported) in getting involved.

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

Name of education provider	University of Lincoln
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James McManus (Clinical psychologist) Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
 - Service User and Carer Panel response British Psychological Society (BPS) report
 - Annual report 2013-14
 - Portfolio of proficiencies

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the evidence provided that service users and carers are involved in a number of ways on the programme such as selection and research. However, the visitors were not able to see any evidence to demonstrate that service users and carers are appropriately prepared and supported to undertake these roles. As such, they require further evidence that this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence and information about how service users and carers are prepared and supported to undertake their roles on 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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted from the response to the external examiner's report 2014-15 that the education provider was intending to make changes to how the clinical aspects of the programme are examined in the new research-focussed programme. Furthermore, the visitors noted from the last annual monitoring audit that there may be changes to how the programme will be funded. The visitors reviewed the current audit and were satisfied that funding is secure for the immediate future. However, if the education provider does make any changes, it should consider the impact that this will have on the standards of education and training and inform the HCPC via the major change process.