

Annual 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(s)	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 4)
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Other documents submitted:

- Course Management Meeting Minutes
- Curriculum Vitae of new staff

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-17	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report ARU SP Level 4 PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic) incorporating DipHE Medical Imaging Practice
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Martin Benwell (Radiographer) Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer)
Education executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-16	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report ARU BSc (Hons) Drad PtT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Therapeutic) incorporating FDS Sc Radiotherapy and Oncology Practice
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Martin Benwell (Radiographer) Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer)
Education executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-25	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report ARU BSc (Hons) Trad PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	John Strange (Music Therapist) Colin Keiley (Operating Department Practitioner) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	15 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
 - Internal quality report for one year ago
 - Internal quality report for two years ago
 - External Examiner's for one year ago
 - External Examiner's Report for two years ago
 - Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
 - Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- CV for Sue Lord
 - CV for Trevor Money
 - Evidence for approved major change May 2009

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-17	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report ARU DipHE ODP FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 3)
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Other documents submitted:

- Course Management Meeting Minutes
- Curriculum Vitae of new staff

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-17	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report ARU SP Level 3 PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Martin Benwell (Radiographer) Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer)
Education executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
 - Internal quality report for one year ago
 - Internal quality report for two years ago
 - External Examiner's for one year ago
 - External Examiner's 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 audit reports 2008 and 2009
 - Minutes of Board of Studies meeting 21 October 2009
 - Minutes of Board of Studies meeting 10 November 2008

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-16	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report Cardiff BSc (Hons) DRad FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Susan Lloyd (Occupational Therapist) Jo Jackson (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	15 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-17	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report Cardiff BSc (Hons) OT FT & PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Colin Keiley (Operating Department Practitioner) Jo Jackson (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	15 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's 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
- Academic handbook
- Quality progress review report

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-15	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report Cardiff BSc (Hons) PH FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Martin Benwell (Radiographer) Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer)
Education executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
 - Internal quality report for one year ago
 - Internal quality report for two years ago
 - External Examiner's for one year ago
 - External Examiner's 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 audit reports 2008 and 2009
 - Minutes of Board of Studies meeting 21 October 2009
 - Minutes of Board of Studies meeting 10 November 2008

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-16	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report Cardiff BSc (Hons) TRad FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)
Programme name	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Colin Keiley (Operating Department Practitioner) Jo Jackson (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	15 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's 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 Statement
- Student Programme Handbook 2009
- SOHCS Student Handbook 2009
- Information Pack: ODP Student Profile 2009
- Admissions- Extract from Submission Document 2007
- SoPs mapping form
- 'Clinical Mentors who have level 3 qualifications' table

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-15	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report Cardiff Dip HE ODP FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)
Programme name	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time accelerated
HPC visitor(s)	Susan Lloyd (Occupational Therapist) Jo Jackson (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	15 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Visitors Comments

The visitors noted that within the annual programme review document the education provider identified challenges with the space available for teaching. They would like it to be noted that future annual monitoring assessments may expect this issue to have been addressed.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-17	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report Cardiff Pg Dip OT FT acc	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Annual Monitoring Requirements	2
Section Four: Additional Documentation	2
Section Five: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	3

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	East Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust
Awarding institution	Institute of Health Care Development (IHCD)
Programme name	IHCD Paramedic Award
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
HPC visitors	Jackie Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
Education executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	15 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
 - Internal quality report for one year ago
 - Internal quality report for two years ago
 - External Examiner's for one year ago
 - External Examiner's Report for two years ago
 - Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
 - Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Additional documentation for Ambulance Trust AM requirements
- There is no external examiners report for two years ago (2007-2008) as there was no visit undertaken in that year as it was prior to HPC approval due to issues at the external validating body, edexcel.

Section Three: Additional Annual Monitoring Requirements

The following documentation was submitted in response to the additional annual monitoring requirements for the programme:

1. An update on the progress of implementing and embedding professional skills into the delivery of their programme.

Appendix 1 - External examiners report 2009/2010
 Appendix 2 - Internal quality document 2009
 Appendix 5a - Copy of J Ellis Critical review as part of Research Module
 Appendix 5b - Copy of EBP results for D Bradley
 Appendix 5c - Copy of Module application
 Appendix 6 - Clinical education tutors development pathway 2010-02-17
 Appendix 7 - Copy of one HDQ certificate
 Appendix 12 - IHCD rule changes supplementary
 Appendix 14 - Copies of External review pilot Docs.

2. An update on the progress of implementing the range of appropriate placements.

Appendix 4a - EMHWD Placement Meeting minutes
 Appendix 4b - PCT placement meeting agenda 23 April 2009
 Appendix 4c - PCT placement meeting minutes 23 April 2009
 Appendix 4d - PCT placement partnership group meeting minutes 8 Oct 09
 Appendix 13 - Version 6 Clinical placements Handbook

3. An update on the availability resources and confirmation of the ongoing provisions.

Appendix 3 - EMAS Business plan 2009/2014 organisational learning
 Appendix 8 - Current asset registers
 Appendix 9 - Phase One; Two and Three Resource Ordering in Dec 2008

Section Four: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-14	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report Ambulance Trust - EMAS NHS Trust - IHCD PA - FT&PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

The visitors also agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation on how the programme has addressed the Education & Training Committee’s requirements for updates on: progress of implementing and embedding professional skills into the delivery of the programme; progress of implementing the range of appropriate placements; availability of resources and confirmation of the ongoing provisions.

Section Five: Recommendation of the visitors

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

There is also sufficient evidence the programme has addressed the Education & Training Committee’s requirements for updates on: progress of implementing and embedding professional skills into the delivery of the programme; progress of implementing the range of appropriate placements; availability of resources and confirmation of the ongoing provisions. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Visitors' Comments

The visitors noted that in appendix 5a, 5b and 5c there were examples of a students’ work, a students’ module application and an example of a students’ results letter. The visitors stated that any documentation pertaining to specific students should be anonymised before being provided to the HPC. The HPC has no requirement to see documentation relating to specific students. If needed, anonymous examples will suffice.

The visitors were satisfied that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). However, the visitors wished to point out that the comprehensive nature of the submission was not entirely conducive to coming to their decision. While HPC’s Education and Training Committee asked for some additional information and while it is recognised that this required additional documentation, the visitors stated that the education provider should consider the relevance of submitted documentation, as the documentation necessary for an audit submission such as this is usually far less than provided for this audit. The annual monitoring process is a retrospective one focusing on programmes with ongoing approval and as such a submission usually only consists of the required documentation as highlighted above. Any additional information is only needed when the programme has undergone changes which affect how the SETs continue to be met. The visitors would therefore like to highlight to the education provider that the volume of documentation, and subsequently work, is not necessary for any future HPC annual monitoring audit.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-14	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report Ambulance Trust - EMAS NHS Trust - IHCD PA - FT&PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Edinburgh Napier University
Programme name	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Nurses, Midwives and Allied Health Professionals (formerly known as Non-Medical Prescribing)
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

There was no Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago submitted. The education provider's policy is not to provide a response to external examiner comments unless a problem has been identified.

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Visitors' Comments

The visitors have noted there has been a change in programme leader to this programme which was included in this annual monitoring submission. The visitors wish to emphasize to the education provider that changes of this nature would have a potential impact on the HPC standards of education and training. Therefore in future, changes of this nature need to be communicated to the HPC through the major change process as soon as the change has occurred or once it is confirmed the change will occur.

The visitors have noted there has been a change in programme title to this programme which was included in this annual monitoring submission. The visitors wish to emphasize to the education provider that, in future, changes of this nature normally need to be communicated to the HPC through the major change process.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-25	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Edinburgh Napier - SP - PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	University of Essex
Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	John Strange (Music Therapist) Colin Keiley (Operating Department Practitioner) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	15 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-25	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report Essex MSc PH FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical Scientist) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Lesley Culling (Speech and Language Therapist)
Education executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
 - Internal quality report for one year ago
 - Internal quality report for two years ago
 - External Examiner's for one year ago
 - External Examiner's 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 Board and staff/student meetings minutes

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Visitors Comments

The visitors suggest that the education provider may want to review the documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation. The visitors noted from the documentation that the education provider on occasion is using out of date terminology. In particular the visitors noted repeated reference to 'state registration'.

The visitors noted that there was a major change submission currently being reviewed by the HPC which contained information of a change in programme title.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-17	a	EDU	RPT	AM Report - GCU - BSc (Hons) BS - FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	John Strange (Music Therapist) Colin Keiley (Operating Department Practitioner) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	15 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
 - Internal quality report for one year ago
 - Internal quality report for two years ago
 - External Examiner's for one year ago
 - External Examiner's 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 programme document volume 1 January 2010
 - Definitive programme document volume 2 January 2010

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-15	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report GCU DipHE ODP FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 10)
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Other documents submitted:

- Module Monitoring Reports

There were no responses to external examiner reports submitted as there were no comments that required action. The documentation submitted reflects this in Annual Programme Analysis documents.

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-17	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report GCU SP Level 10 PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 11)
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Other documents submitted:

- Module Monitoring Reports

There were no responses to external examiner reports submitted as there were no comments that required action. The documentation submitted reflects this in Annual Programme Analysis documents.

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-17	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report GCU SP Level 11 PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 9)
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Other documents submitted:

- Module Monitoring Reports

There were no responses to external examiner reports submitted as there were no comments that required action. The documentation submitted reflects this in Annual Programme Analysis documents.

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-17	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report GCU SP Level 9 PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Glyndwr University
Awarding institution	University of Wales
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Susan Lloyd (Occupational Therapist) Jo Jackson (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	15 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
 - Internal quality report for one year ago
 - Internal quality report for two years ago
 - External Examiner's for one year ago
 - External Examiner's Report for two years ago
 - Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
 - Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Letter to Health Professions Council notifying regarding change to University status and therefore change of name
 - Major Change Notification Form sent to Health Professions Council

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-17	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report Glyndwr BSc (Hons) OT PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Keele University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Susan Lloyd (Occupational Therapist) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	15 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-17	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report Keele BSc (Hons) PH PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	3

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full Time
HPC visitor(s)	Fiona McCullough (Dietitian) Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical Scientist)
Education executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day / postal review	4 May 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Other Documents Submitted:

- Programme specification revised format
- Faculty annual quality reports

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

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

Reason

The visitors require information to outline the resources that are in place to support student learning effectively. The visitors noted that students raised a number of concerns around access to computers, access to journal articles and issues around room availability and room temperature. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation provided that these issues had been addressed. The visitors therefore require information to describe how resource issues are addressed and in particular require information about whether the move to the new campus has addressed some of these concerns.

5.7.5 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of communication and lines of responsibility.

Reason

The visitors require information to describe the lines of responsibility for academic staff involved in placements and to clarify lines of communication between staff and students when on placements. The visitors noted that the documentation highlighted student dissatisfaction with the process for visits from academic staff to practice placements. The visitors also noted from the documentation that the role of the link lecturer was not fully established. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation that these issues have been addressed. The visitors therefore require further information to describe the process for academic staff visiting practice placements and the communication mechanisms in place to liaise with students on placement. The visitors require documentation clearly describing the roles and responsibilities of academic staff around placements.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2009-09-01	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Visitors Comment

The visitors noted that students raised some concerns around the range and cost of meals on campus. The visitors suggest that the action points that talk about addressing the pricing and quality of meals are addressed.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2009-09-01	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	3

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme name	Pg Dip Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full Time
HPC visitor(s)	Fiona McCullough (Dietitian) Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical Scientist)
Education executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day / postal review	4 May 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Other Documents Submitted:

- Programme specification revised format

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

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

Reason

The visitors require information to outline the resources that are in place to support student learning effectively. The visitors noted that students raised a number of concerns around access to computers, access to journal articles and issues around room availability and room temperature. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation provided that these issues had been addressed but did note that the documentation talks about the introduction of a new build having an impact on resource provision. The visitors therefore require information to describe how resource issues are addressed and in particular require information about whether the new build has addressed some of these concerns.

5.7.5 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of communication and lines of responsibility.

Reason

The visitors require information to describe the lines of responsibility for academic staff involved in placements and to clarify lines of communication between staff and students when on placements. The visitors noted that the documentation highlighted student dissatisfaction with the process for visits from academic staff to practice placements. The visitors also noted from the documentation that the role of the link lecturer was not fully established. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation that these issues have been addressed. The visitors therefore require further information to describe the process for academic staff visiting practice placements and the communication mechanisms in place to liaise with students on placement. The visitors require documentation clearly describing the roles and responsibilities of academic staff around placements.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2009-09-01	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Visitors Comment

The visitors noted that students raised some concerns around the range and cost of meals on campus. The visitors suggest that the action points that talk about addressing the pricing and quality of meals are addressed.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2009-09-01	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	London South Bank University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Graham Harris (Paramedic)
Education executive	Osama Ammar
Date of assessment day / postal review	16 March 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's 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 additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

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

Reason

The visitors noted that amended module descriptors, in the section marked “employability” indicated that successful completion of the programme led to “state registration”. It was also noted that on p17 of the 2007-2008 internal monitoring report a statement was made that all modules must be completed in order to pass the programme and achieve HPC registration. The visitors stated that this was misrepresentative of the independence of HPC from government in its regulatory function and the requirements for health and character checks at the point of registration. The visitors felt this could mislead applicants and students. The visitors therefore require amended module descriptors and advertising materials which clearly state that successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register in order to feel satisfied that this standard continues to be met.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-02	c	EDU	RPT	AM Report - LSBU - BSc (Hons) PH - PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	London South Bank University
Programme name	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist)
Education executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	16 March 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

The programme was last visited in 2007 so only one year's annual monitoring documentation was available.

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

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

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practice.

Reason

The visitors noted that within the examiners report for the academic year 2008-2009 concerns were expressed over the practice of allowing an aggregate pass mark to compensate one fail in assessment. The external examiner felt that this practice did not guarantee that students would meet all of the learning outcomes. The visitors were unable to locate the education provider's response to this concern and therefore felt that there was a possibility that students allowed to progress via a compensated route would not meet the standards of proficiency. The visitors therefore require information to show how the compensation policy ensures students can demonstrate fitness to practice.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-25	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - LSBU - PgDip OT - FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	London South Bank University
Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate in Non-medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical Scientist)
Education executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day / postal review	18 March 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's 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 additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practice.

Reason

The Faculty of Health and Social Care annual programme monitoring report for non-medical prescribing academic year 2007-2008 states that there was a credit change to the 'existing 30 credit M programme for nurses and pharmacists to 60 H level credits with the award of a Graduate Certificate and 60 M level credits for the award of a post graduate certificate to bring all professions undertaking the programme into line and ensure equality between professions'. There has been no major change submitted to the HPC for a change of this nature and it was unclear as to whether this change had been addressed at the original HPC approval visit in July 2006. The visitors are concerned by this statement and require further evidence that the programme has not made this change or has made the change and the assessment of this module continues to ensure the student can demonstrate fitness to practice and meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the register.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-02	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - LSBU Pg Cert Non-medical Prescribing PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme name	Prescribing for Non Medical Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Bob Fellows (Paramedic) Caroline Sykes (Speech and Language Therapist)
Education executive	Paula Lescott
Date of assessment day / postal review	4 May 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's 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 additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Reason

From a review of the documentation submitted there was a comment in the external examiners' report for 2008/2009 regarding students in Singapore. The visitors noted that the external examiners' report covered both this programme and a District Nursing Interventions programme. The visitors require clarification regarding which programme this comment was in relation to, and if it referred to this programme, confirmation that students studying outside of the UK would not be eligible to have their name annotated on the HPC Register.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-14	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Northumbria - Non-Med Prescribing - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors	2
Section Five: Visitors comments.....	3

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitors	Maureen Henderson (Dietician) Elspeth McCartney (Speech and Language Therapist)
Education executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day / postal review	18 March 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's 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 additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme team reorganised between 2007-08 and 2008-09. The visitors were not clear about the management structure of the programme due to this change. In particular it had become less apparent where the titles such as 'programme lead' and 'professional lead' were now placed in the new programme management structure. From the evidence provided the visitors were not satisfied a clear management structure was in place to effectively manage the programme. The visitors therefore require documentation which articulates the management structure of the programme to be satisfied this standard continues to be met.

3.3 There must be a named programme leader who has overall responsibility for the programme and who should be either on the relevant part of the HPC Register or otherwise appropriately qualified and experienced.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the Standards of Education and Training (SETs) mapping document for SET 3.3 and on page 1 of the '2008-2009 Annual Programme Monitoring Report' that Elizabeth Allott assumed the role of programme lead in February 2009. The visitors also noted the presence of a 'professional lead' on the programme. In light of these two roles, the visitors were not clear which role held overall responsibility for the programme for the purposes of meeting this standard. Therefore, the visitors require further clarification of the named programme leader for the programme. Furthermore, if Elizabeth Allott is the named programme leader, the visitors require the current curriculum vitae of this staff member to be satisfied this standard continues to be met.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-02	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - PLY - BSc (Hons) DT - ft	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section Five: Visitors comments

The visitors would like to make the education provider aware that a programme leader change is considered a major change by the HPC. They note that while the programme lead for this programme is not the recognised contact for the HPC a change to the person with overall responsibility for the programme would need to go through the HPC major change process in the future. Information about this is highlighted in the 'Major change Supplementary information for education providers' (p.29)

The visitors also noted in the SETs mapping document for SET 3.4 that the programme suffered the loss of two staff in September 2008. This has had the effect of reducing the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff delivering the programme from 9.3 to 7.8 WTE registered dietitians. The visitors recommend that the education provider continues to monitor the effect of this change on the effective delivery of the course as evidenced by external examiners reports, internal quality assurance and student feedback.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-02	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - PLY - BSc (Hons) DT - ft	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practitioner (Community Emergency Health)
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Bob Fellows (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Podiatrist)
Education executive	Paula Lescott
Date of assessment day / postal review	16 March 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

This submission included one years' of annual monitoring documentation as the programme did not commence until September 2008.

- Advertising material
- Programme and module handbooks
- Programme meeting minutes
- Placement documentation including mentor details

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Reason: The visitors require information to clarify the student numbers on the programme from the first cohort until present day in order to ensure that this standard is being met.

The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation provided the exact cohort numbers since the programme started. From a review of the documentation the visitors saw an approximate range of student numbers recorded, from 30 to 40 per cohort, and the visitors noted that there had been an apparent increase in cohort numbers. The visitors require further clarification in order to determine if the student numbers and the number of programme staff are appropriate for this programme.

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

Reason: The visitors require information to clarify the current programme team in order to ensure that this standard is being met.

From the documentation provided and information given by the programme team regarding planned changes to programme team staff and numbers the visitors were unable to determine the full extent of the current programme team. The visitors were therefore unable to determine if this standard is met. In the documentation it was indicated that the programme team had recruited two 0.5 whole time equivalent (wte) staff members as they had planned, but it was not clear if the remaining staff in the recruitment plan (1.7 wte) had been or was being recruited and the timelines for this action.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-25	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Plymouth BSc (Hons) PA FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme name	Graduate Diploma Paramedic Practitioner (Community Emergency Health)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Bob Fellows (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Podiatrist)
Education executive	Paula Lescott
Date of assessment day / postal review	16 March 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

This submission included one years' of annual monitoring documentation as the programme did not commence until September 2008.

- Advertising material
- Programme and module handbooks
- Programme meeting minutes
- Placement documentation including mentor details

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Reason: The visitors require information to clarify the student numbers on the programme from the first cohort until present day in order to ensure that this standard is being met.

The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation provided the exact cohort numbers since the programme started. From a review of the documentation the visitors saw an approximate range of student numbers recorded, from 30 to 40 per cohort, and the visitors noted that there had been an apparent increase in cohort numbers. The visitors require further clarification in order to determine if the student numbers and the number of programme staff are appropriate for this programme.

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

Reason: The visitors require information to clarify the current programme team in order to ensure that this standard is being met.

From the documentation provided and information given by the programme team regarding planned changes to programme team staff and numbers the visitors were unable to determine the full extent of the current programme team. The visitors were therefore unable to determine if this standard is met. In the documentation it was indicated that the programme team had recruited two 0.5 whole time equivalent (wte) staff members as they had planned, but it was not clear if the remaining staff in the recruitment plan (1.7 wte) had been or was being recruited and the timelines for this action.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-05-28	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Plymouth Grad Dip PA FT & PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	2
Visitors' Comments.....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full Time
HPC visitor(s)	Fiona McCullough (Dietitian) Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical Scientist)
Education executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day / postal review	4 May 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Visitors' Comments

The visitors want it to be noted that they recommend the education provider consider a more in depth submission for future annual monitoring audits. In particular they felt that the minutes to the education providers meetings that were submitted were lacking in detail. For future submissions they would like it to be noted that more detail around student feedback and placement audits would be useful.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2009-09-01	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme name	MSc Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Emma Supple (Podiatrist) Derek Adrian-Harris (Radiographer)
Education executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day / postal review	4 May 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's 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 documents not submitted were not available due to the first delivery of this programme being in 2008-2009 so the programme did not run two years ago.

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-25	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report QMU MSc TRAD FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	2
Visitors' Comment	3

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	The Robert Gordon University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Peter Ruddy (Biomedical Scientist) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
Education executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day / postal review	18 March 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's 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 additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

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

Reason

The programme submitted a major change to the HPC in June 2007 regarding an increase in student numbers. The number given to the HPC in this major change was 28 students, this was assessed by visitors and ongoing approval was confirmed. The annual programme appraisal report for 2007-2008 stated that the actual number of students taken on was 30. The annual programme appraisal report 2008-2009 does not have any mention of student numbers. The visitors were concerned by this larger student intake, the pressures this could put on the programme staff ratio and the fact it had not been identified in the report the following year. The visitors require further evidence that there are enough staff in post to deliver an effective programme and that the education provider can cope with this increased cohort number.

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Reason

The annual programme appraisal report undergraduate 2008-09 has a statement (section 9 subheading 4) which identifies the 'failure of the provision of laboratory placements' and notes there is risk with the legalities of the Memorandum of Co-operation. The visitors were concerned with this statement and notes it does not identify the exact programme this relates back to – the report covers a number of programmes only one of which is HPC approved. The visitors require further information regarding this statement to identify the programme it relates to. If the statement applies to the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences programme then the visitors require evidence that this statement has been addressed and the longevity of the partnerships between the education provider and the practice placements are secure.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-02	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Robert Gordon BSc (Hons) Applied BS FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Visitors' Comment

The visitors noted in the course/programme management team response to external examiner annual report 2007-2008, the external examiner had stated it was essential to consider whether the final year pathology specialisms were being taught at honours level. In the course/programme management team response to external examiner annual report 2008-2009, the external examiner had stated it was essential to continue to be vigilant in ensuring the final year pathology specialisms were being taught at honours level. The visitors agreed that the education provider had identified the comment, it had been addressed and was being monitored by the education provider, however they wished to reiterate the comment and add that the education provider should continue to monitor the level at which the final year pathology specialisms were being taught in order to ensure that the threshold level of the standards of proficiency continue to be met by successful graduates.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-02	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Robert Gordon BSc (Hons) Applied BS FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	2
Visitors' Comment	3

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	The Robert Gordon University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Peter Ruddy (Biomedical Scientist) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
Education executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day / postal review	18 March 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's 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 additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

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

Reason

The programme submitted a major change to the HPC in June 2007 regarding an increase in student numbers. The number given to the HPC in this major change was 28 students, this was assessed by visitors and ongoing approval was confirmed. The annual programme appraisal report for 2007-2008 stated that the actual number of students taken on was 30. The annual programme appraisal report 2008-2009 does not have any mention of student numbers. The visitors were concerned by this larger student intake, the pressures this could put on the programme staff ratio and the fact it had not been identified in the report the following year. The visitors require further evidence that there are enough staff in post to deliver an effective programme and that the education provider can cope with this increased cohort number.

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Reason

The annual programme appraisal report undergraduate 2008-09 has a statement (section 9 subheading 4) which identifies the 'failure of the provision of laboratory placements' and notes there is risk with the legalities of the Memorandum of Co-operation. The visitors were concerned with this statement and notes it does not identify the exact programme this relates back to – the report covers a number of programmes only one of which is HPC approved. The visitors require further information regarding this statement to identify the programme it relates to. If the statement applies to the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences programme then the visitors require evidence that this statement has been addressed and the longevity of the partnerships between the education provider and the practice placements are secure.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-02	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Robert Gordon BSc (Hons) Applied BS FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Visitors' Comment

The visitors noted in the course/programme management team response to external examiner annual report 2007-2008, the external examiner had stated it was essential to consider whether the final year pathology specialisms were being taught at honours level. In the course/programme management team response to external examiner annual report 2008-2009, the external examiner had stated it was essential to continue to be vigilant in ensuring the final year pathology specialisms were being taught at honours level. The visitors agreed that the education provider had identified the comment, it had been addressed and was being monitored by the education provider, however they wished to reiterate the comment and add that the education provider should continue to monitor the level at which the final year pathology specialisms were being taught in order to ensure that the threshold level of the standards of proficiency continue to be met by successful graduates.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-02	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Robert Gordon BSc (Hons) Applied BS FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	The Robert Gordon University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Bruce Bayley (Drama therapist) Maureen Henderson (Dietician)
Education executive	Brendon Edmonds
Date of assessment day / postal review	18 March 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's 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 additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

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

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practice.

Reason: The visitors noted in the Annual Programme Appraisal Report 2007/2008 the programme had made revisions to the content, delivery and assessment within various modules on the programme. To ensure these standards continue to be met, the visitors require further documentation outlining these changes. The visitors would expect to see the updated module descriptors for the programme and a Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) cross mapping document indicating where the SOPs are now delivered and assessed on the programme.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-25	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - RGU - BSc (Hons) DT - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme name	Pg Dip Radiotherapy and Oncology in Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Martin Benwell (Radiographer) Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer)
Education executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-16	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report SHU PG DDip TRAD Full time	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	University of Strathclyde
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Pathology
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical Scientist) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Lesley Culling (Speech and Language Therapist)
Education executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Visitors Comments

The visitors noted that where concerns were expressed within the course monitoring reports it was difficult to follow through how the education provider responded to these concerns. The visitors also noted that it was difficult to clearly follow the education providers' responses to the external examiners comments from the external examiners reports. The visitors suggest that the education provider may want to consider reviewing the pro forma it uses to simplify this process and to clearly show where and how the education provider has responded to comments and concerns and what actions have been taken.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-17	a	EDU	RPT	AM Report - Strathclyde -BSc (Hons) SL - FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Teesside University
Programme name	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Colin Keiley (Operating Department Practitioner) Jo Jackson (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	15 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

- ODP Programme Board minutes for the last 2 years

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-15	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report Teesside DipHE ODP FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Teesside University
Programme name	University Certificate of Professional Development Non Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-17	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report Teesside CertPD SP PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	University of Ulster
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science with DPP (Pathology)
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical Scientist) Martin Benwell (Radiographer) Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer)
Education executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

- Dr Ron Cutler's CV
- IPL publication
- Student handbook

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-17	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report Ulster BSc (Hons) BMS with DPP FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	University of Ulster
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitors	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Simon Willoughby – Booth (Art therapist)
Education executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	4 May 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Additional documents:

- ASM Programme Management Pilot Checklist 08 PT

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practice safely and effectively.

Reason

The visitors noted in the documentation that modules SFA1 and SFA2 have been combined into a '...long thin module' which has reduced the assessment load. The visitors felt that this change could affect how the learning outcomes and skills are delivered by this module. The visitors stated that this change could affect how students meet the required standards of proficiency for physiotherapists. Therefore the visitors' require the module descriptors for modules SFA1 and SFA2 as well as the module descriptor for the combined 'long thin' module to gain an understanding of how the learning outcomes delivered by SFA 1 and SFA 2 are now delivered by the new module.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-04	c	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Ulster - BSc (Hons) PH - FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	3

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	University of the West of Scotland
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical Scientist)
Education executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day / postal review	18 March 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Other documents:

- Employers' Liaison Group (agendas, minutes and progress against actions: June 2008 – June 2009)
- CV for Robin Freeburn
- UWS Attendance Regulations (and absence monitoring flowchart)
- Quality Student Enhancement Report

- School Learning and Teaching Report

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Reason

The external examiners reports (external examiners annual report for taught provision 2007-2008 and subject external examiners annual report for taught provision 2008-2009) submitted made comments referring to inconsistencies in the annotations made during the marking of assessments. The audit documentation submitted showed that the education provider had not adequately addressed these comments. The visitors therefore require further evidence that these concerns have been addressed by the programme team to ensure the management of the programme appropriately takes into account both student feedback and the external examiner reports.

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

Reason

The programme annual report 2008-2009 (section 2) stated that there would be staffing issues resulting from a number academic staff retiring. This was repeated (section 5) where it was stated the 'replacement of the staff is essential for the continuing delivery of the programme'. The visitors were concerned by this issue and require further evidence that the programme has an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme in light of the comments the author of the programme annual report has made.

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practice.

Reason

The quality of student experience report 2007-2008 (section 4) states that the research module will be 'redesigned for 40 points and include a taught component'. This is reiterated in the subject external examiners annual report for taught provision (section 4) where it is noted there is 'room for development of more critical appraisal and analytical skills in the final year, particularly in the Honours research project'. There has been no major change submitted to the HPC for a change of this nature. The visitors are concerned by this statement and require further evidence that the programme has not made this change or has made the change and the assessment of this module continues to ensure

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-02	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report- UWS BSc (Hons) Applied BS FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

the student can demonstrate fitness to practice and meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the register.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-02	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report- UWS BSc (Hons) Applied BS FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	University of York
Programme name	Extended Independent Supplementary Prescribing for Non Medical Prescribers (Level 6)
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Responses to External Examiner's reports for one year ago and for two years ago have not been submitted. Although there is a formal process for responding to examiners, correspondence has indicated verbal feedback is normally given instead.

Other documents submitted:

- Minutes of course monitoring meetings 2007 and 2008
- Student evaluations from 2009-2010
- Non-Medical Prescribing Application Pack
- Non-Medical Prescribing Module Handbook level 6 and level 7
- Non-Medical Prescribing Knowledge and Competency Framework
- Non-medical Prescribing Assessment Strategy, Level 6 and Level 7

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-17	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report York SP Level 6 PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	University of York
Programme name	Extended Independent Supplementary Prescribing for Non Medical Prescribers (Level 7)
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Responses to External Examiner's reports for one year ago and for two years ago have not been submitted. Although there is a formal process for responding to examiners, correspondence has indicated verbal feedback is normally given instead.

Other documents submitted:

- Minutes of course monitoring meetings 2007 and 2008
- Student evaluations from 2009-2010
- Non-Medical Prescribing Application Pack
- Non-Medical Prescribing Module Handbook level 6 and level 7
- Non-Medical Prescribing Knowledge and Competency Framework
- Non-medical Prescribing Assessment Strategy, Level 6 and Level 7

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-17	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report York SP level 7 PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Annual Monitoring Requirements	2
Section Four: Additional Documentation	2
Section Five: Recommendation of the visitors.....	3

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Yorkshire Ambulance Service NHS Trust
Awarding institution	Institute of Health Care Development (IHCD)
Programme name	IHCD Paramedic Award
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
HPC visitors	Jackie Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
Education executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day / postal review	15 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
 - Internal quality report for one year ago
 - Internal quality report for two years ago
 - External Examiner's for one year ago
 - External Examiner's Report for two years ago
 - Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
 - Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Additional documentation for Ambulance Trust AM requirements
- Explained via email that there is no extant external examiners report for two years ago. This was also a subject which was covered in the approval visit to the programme which occurred at that time.

Section Three: Additional Annual Monitoring Requirements

The following documentation was submitted in response to the additional annual monitoring requirements for the programme:

1. An update on the progress of implementing and embedding professional skills into the delivery of their programme.

Programme Handbook, Module Guides and Learning Outcomes Midwife pack and Letter to Midwife Placement diary, PPQA student feedback comments
--

2. An update on the progress of implementing the range of appropriate placements.

Practice Placement Co-ordinator job description and Practice Placement Administrator job description SHA/YAS Placement project plan Placement allocation sheet Honorary contract quality assurance form
--

3. An update on the availability resources and confirmation of the ongoing provisions.

Budget overview Updated site document
--

Section Four: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

The visitors also agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation on how the programme has addressed the Education & Training Committee's requirements for updates on: progress of implementing and embedding professional skills into the delivery of the programme; progress of implementing the range of appropriate placements; availability of resources and confirmation of the ongoing provisions.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-14	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report Ambulance Trust - YAS NHS Trust - IHCD PA - FT&PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Section Five: Recommendation of the visitors

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

There is also sufficient evidence the programme has addressed the Education & Training Committee's requirements for updates on: progress of implementing and embedding professional skills into the delivery of the programme; progress of implementing the range of appropriate placements; availability of resources and confirmation of the ongoing provisions. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Visitors' Comments

The visitors noted that in IHCD Paramedic Courses Board Report were examples of the use of specific students' names in meeting minutes. The visitors stated that any documentation pertaining to specific students should be anonymised before being provided to the HPC. The HPC has no requirement to see documentation relating to specific students. If needed, anonymous examples will suffice.

The visitors were satisfied that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). However, the visitors wished to point out that the comprehensive nature of the submission was not entirely conducive to coming to their decision. While HPC's Education and Training Committee asked for some additional information and while it is recognised that this required additional documentation, the visitors stated that the education provider should consider the relevance of submitted documentation as the documentation necessary for an audit submission such as this is usually far less than provided for this audit. The annual monitoring process is a retrospective one focusing on programmes with ongoing approval and as such a submission usually only consists of the required documentation as highlighted above. Any additional information is only needed when the programme has undergone changes which affect how the SETs continue to be met. The visitors would therefore like to highlight to the education provider that the volume of documentation, and subsequently work, is not necessary for any future HPC annual monitoring audit.

The visitors also noticed that the letter describing the need for paramedic trainees to meet HPC standards of conduct performance and ethics contains language which may be misleading for students. The letter states that 'In order for you to register with the Health Professions Council as a Paramedic there are certain duties and responsibilities you have to uphold.' The visitors feel that this could be misleading for students as successful completion of the course and adherence to the standards of conduct and ethics only confers eligibility to apply to the HPC register. They therefore suggest that the wording of this letter be changed in order that students are not unintentionally misled.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-14	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report Ambulance Trust - YAS NHS Trust - IHCD PA - FT&PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None