

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Birmingham City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic radiographer)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	24 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography Course Guide
 - CV for Denise Baker

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: From a review of the annual monitoring standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document the visitors were directed to the Student Learning Agreement within the BSc (Hons) Radiography Course Guide as evidence of meeting this standard. The visitors noted that the Student Learning Agreement made reference to professionalism and conduct issues, however were unable to see where specific reference is made to the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors also note that the Student Learning Agreement is broad in nature and includes information on more practical issues such as attendance and criminal conviction checks.

The annual monitoring SETs mapping document also makes reference to a year three module, APP3 as evidence of meeting this standard. The visitors were not provided with any evidence of the content of this module. The visitors therefore require further evidence that clearly outlines where the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum and how the education provider ensures that students understand how and when the standards apply.

Suggested Documentation: Evidence that clearly outlines where the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum and how the education provider ensures that students understand how and when the standards apply. Documentation may include APP3 module and evidence of professional issues (HPC specific) covered during induction.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: From a review of the annual monitoring documentation the visitors noted a comment within the Programme Annual Review (2009–2010) where it states that 'due to the staggered nature of training, clinical assessment got off to a slow start in some departments and this resulted in some students having to be

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - BCU - BSc (Hons) DRAD - FT & PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

deferred in this aspect of assessment at the June examination board'. The visitors also noted a number of comments from students about the high student to practice placement educator ratio within placements, commenting that placements could often be overcrowded with students. The visitors were concerned that overcrowding of placements could impact on the students' ability to meet the practice placement learning outcomes and that any deferral in assessment could result in a lack of equality in student progression. The visitors therefore seek reassurance that the issues of placement overcrowding, placement capacity and student to practice placement educator ratio are being addressed.

Suggested Documentation: Action plan addressing quality issues around placement capacity, student overcrowding and student to practice placement educator ratio.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - BCU - BSc (Hons) DRAD - FT & PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)	CCCU and University of Greenwich
Programme title	Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist) Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

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

- Student complaints procedure
- Fitness to practise panel information
- Year One Orientation module handbook for 2011

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: From a review of the annual monitoring standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document the visitors were directed to the Year One Orientation Module Handbook as evidence of meeting this standard. The visitors noted within the handbook references to professional codes of conduct and the regulatory or legislative framework. However they were unable to see where in this document the curriculum refers specifically to the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics and how the education provider ensured that students understand how and when they apply. Under Interactive Module Resources, the visitors noted the link to the HPC home page on the web but as no direction to the standards of conduct, performance and ethics was provided, they felt that this would not provide a student with the information needed to be able to locate the standards.

The visitors would therefore like to receive further information that clearly outlines how and where the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum.

Suggested documentation: Clear evidence that outlines where the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum. This may have been in relevant module descriptors.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-20	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - CCCU - Pg Dip SLT - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-20	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - CCCU - Pg Dip SLT - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic radiographer)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day / postal review	24 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - University Student Complaints Procedure
 - Student Fitness to Practice Policy
 - Professional Development 1 module timetable

- Fundamentals of Professional Collaboration handbook
- External Examiner reports and responses to them are included in the internal quality documents

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: From a review of the annual monitoring standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document the visitors were directed to the Fundamentals of Professional Collaboration (HE4) module as evidence of meeting this standard. The visitors noted within the module reference to professional codes of conduct, however they were unable to see where in this module the curriculum refers specifically to the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics, and how the education provider ensures that students understand how and when they apply. The visitors therefore require further evidence that clearly outlines where the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum.

Suggested documentation: Clear evidence that outlines where the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum. This may be outlines in the relevant module descriptors.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - CCCU - BSc (Hons) DRAD - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - CCCU - BSc (Hons) DRAD - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic radiographer)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	24 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Framework for Students Complaints, Appeals and Disciplinary Procedures
 - PPE27 Academic and Fitness to Practise Appeals July 2010
 - Student complaints procedures 2010
 - SFTPP Paper

- Code of Student Professional Conduct
- SFTPP Student Leaflet
- Assisting with Surgical Intervention Module Outlines
- Introduction to Healthcare Module Outlines
- Professional Development 1 module Outline
- Anaesthetic 2 Module Outlines - MPLHS2ANA
- Fundamentals of Professional Collaboration Student handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: From a review of the annual monitoring standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document the visitors were directed to the Fundamentals of Professional Collaboration (HE4) module as evidence of meeting this standard. The visitors noted within the module reference to professional codes of conduct, however they were unable to see where in this module the curriculum refers specifically to the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics, and how the education provider ensures that students understand how and when they apply. The education provider also directed the visitors to a number of profession specific modules where the education provider suggests that the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics are further reinforced. The visitors were also unable to see where in the profession specific modules the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered. The visitors therefore require further evidence that clearly outlines where the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum.

Suggested documentation: Clear evidence that outlines where the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum. This may be clearly outlined in relevant module descriptors.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - CCCU - BSc (Hons) ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - CCCU - BSc (Hons) ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme title	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic radiographer)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	24 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Framework for Students Complaints, Appeals and Disciplinary Procedures
 - PPE27 Academic and Fitness to Practise Appeals July 2010
 - Student complaints procedures 2010
 - SFTPP Paper

- Code of Student Professional Conduct
- SFTPP Student Leaflet
- Assisting with Surgical Intervention Module Outlines
- Introduction to Healthcare Module Outlines
- Professional Development 1 module Outline
- Anaesthetic 2 Module Outlines - MPLHS2ANA
- Fundamentals of Professional Collaboration Student handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: From a review of the annual monitoring standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document the visitors were directed to the Fundamentals of Professional Collaboration (HE4) module as evidence of meeting this standard. The visitors noted within the module reference to professional codes of conduct, however they were unable to see where in this module the curriculum refers specifically to the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics, and how the education provider ensures that students understand how and when they apply. The education provider also directed the visitors to a number of profession specific modules where the education provider suggests that the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics are further reinforced. The visitors were also unable to see where in the profession specific modules the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered. The visitors therefore require further evidence that clearly outlines where the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum.

Suggested documentation: Clear evidence that outlines where the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum. This may be clearly outlined in relevant module descriptors.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - CCCU - DipHE ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - CCCU - DipHE ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	St. George's, University of London
Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)	University of London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Christine Timms (Orthoptists)
HPC executive	Brendon Edmonds
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

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

- Student complaints procedure
- Undergraduate module directory
- Course description, organisation and regulations

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-31	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - St Georges - BSc (Hons) DRAD - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	St George's, University of London
Name of validating body	University of London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Ann Green (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Procedure for consideration of fitness to study or practise
 - General regulations for students and programmes of study
 - Student complaints and disciplinary procedures 2010-2011
 - Student Handbook 2010-2011

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	St George's, University of London
Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)	University of London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist) Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - SGUL website download: Entry Requirements

- Course Description, Organisation and Regulations: April 2008
- Student Complaints Procedure Web Page and Procedure 10-11
- Fitness to Study or Practice Web Page and Procedure 10-11
- Module Directory: April 2008; Revised July 2009

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - St George's - BSc (Hons) TRAD - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Staffordshire University
Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)	Coventry University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Outreach)
Mode of delivery	Part time (in service)
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Margaret Foster (Occupational therapist) Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

6.3 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting.

Reason: From the documentation provided for this submission the visitors noted that an external examiner noted concerns in their report for 2008-2009 (Westcott) regarding failure procedures, “it is uncomfortable if students can fail a composite assessment...yet still pass the module by achieving a higher grade for the part another assessment” (p5). The Annual report of the Occupational Board of Study 2009-10 stated that in response to the external examiner comment “use of compensation within modules would be reviewed by DOTQAC and amendments requested to BoS” (p5). The visitors noted the nature of this programme meant the documents provided were not just for this programme routes but other routes for this programme delivered at another education provider. In light of this information the visitors could not determine whether the external examiners’ comment related to this particular route and what action was taken as a result. The visitors were concerned that in a professional programme such as this if a student fails certain aspects of the programme and can remain on the programme they may not be able to meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the register upon completion of the programme. The visitors therefore require some clarifications regarding the information provided in the external examiners’ report and information on the subsequent actions taken if needed for this programme.

Suggested documentation: Clarification regarding the assessment procedures for this route of the programme and information regarding any follow-up actions to the external examiners’ comment made.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Staffordshire - BSc (Hons) OT (Outreach) - PT in service	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Staffordshire - BSc (Hons) OT (Outreach) - PT in service	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Staffordshire University
Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)	University of Keele and Staffordshire University
Programme title	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner) Margaret Foster (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

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

- Sample Module Evaluation forms (Staffordshire University and University of Keele formats) and Example Placement Evaluation forms
- Module Monitoring Report
- Strategic Health Authority Quality Review documentation 2008/09 and 2009/10
- Confirmation Letter from HPC regarding change of Award Leader
- Curriculum Vitae of Kim Sutton, ODP Award Leader
- Staffordshire University and University of Keele Student Complaints Procedure
- Contract of Student Behaviour – Staffordshire University and University of Keele
- Staffordshire University Fitness to Practice Committee information
- University of Keele University Fitness to Practice Information
- Standards of Proficiency for ODP mapped against Award outcomes
- Year 1 & 2 timetables and Module Handbooks

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	a	EDU	RPT	AM report - Staffordshire - DipHE ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted from the documents provided that the Staffordshire University Students Complaints Procedure (Item 13) was up for review in May 2011. The visitors wish to comment to the programme team that if any changes are made to the procedures that could affect the standards of education and training they should inform the HPC through the major change process.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	a	EDU	RPT	AM report - Staffordshire - DipHE ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitor report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

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

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Curriculum development meeting minutes
 - Student dilemmas flowchart
 - External examiner assessment board feedback 2008, 2010
 - Application form for students

- Faculty of health quality assurance committee meeting minutes
- Draft timetable
- Application for new external examiner

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: The visitor noted that the audit submission for this programme did not contain internal quality reports for the last two years, an external examiner report for 2008-09 and a response to both external examiner reports by the education provider. The visitor acknowledged the submission of minutes from faculty and curriculum development meetings. However the visitor could not take the decision that the standards of education and training continue to be met in the absence of standard annual monitoring documentation. To be satisfied that there are regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place the visitor requires the submission of the above mentioned documents. These documents should address how the module evaluation is conducted and fed back into the development of the programme.

Suggested documentation: The visitor suggests the submission of internal quality reports for two years, an external examiner report for 2008-09 and responses to these.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: The visitor noted the student dilemmas flowchart submitted to address how the programme meets this standard. The faculty complaints process was also referred to in the audit mapping document, however this was not submitted. To be satisfied this standard is met, the visitor requires a copy of the faculty complaints process. The visitor also requires documentation which details how students are made aware of the complaints process and how they can raise any concerns.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-14	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - Staffordshire - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Suggested documentation: The visitor suggests the submission of the faculty complaints process and evidence of how this process is communicated to students.

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

Reason: The visitor noted the student dilemmas flowchart submitted to address how the programme meets this standard. The professional behaviour contract and faculty complaints process were also referred to in the audit mapping document, however were not submitted. To be satisfied this standard is met, the visitor requests a copy of the professional behaviour contract and faculty complaints process. The visitor also requires documentation which details how students are made aware of the complaints process and how this is used to deal with concerns about profession-related conduct.

Suggested documentation: The visitor suggests the submission of the professional behaviour contract and faculty complaints process and evidence of how this process is communicated to students and how this is used to deal with concerns about profession-related conduct.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-14	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - Staffordshire - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University Campus Suffolk
Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)	Universities of East Anglia and Essex
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner) Margaret Foster (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Appendix 1 – Approved major change form (March 2010)

- Appendix 2 – Self-Assessment Review and Evaluation process
- Appendix 3 – Staff CVs for new team members
- Appendix 4 – Approved Major change form (April 2009)
- Appendix 5 – Student Complaint Procedure
- Appendix 6 – Professional Misconduct / Professional Unsuitability Procedure
- Appendix 7 – Change notification form (March 2011) and information regarding the new Clinical skills provision
- Student Handbook: September 2009

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-31	a	EDU	RPT	AM report - UCS - Dip HE ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Birmingham
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Ann Green (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Comprehensive programme review report
 - Complaints procedure documentation
 - Code of practice on misconduct and fitness to practice
 - CoPP module guide 2010
 - Developing evidence based neurological practice module descriptor

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: The documentation provided by the education provider included a clear set of documentation which described the student complaints process which is in place. However, the visitors could not determine how the programme team inform students where the complaints process information can be accessed.

Suggested documentation: Information to clarify how the programme team inform students of the student complaints process.

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

Reason: The programme team have provided evidence in the documentary submission as to how students on the programme 'Critically analyse the requirements to practice including professional legal and ethical boundaries, demonstrating knowledge of current HPC and UK legislation.' However, the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensures that students understand the implications of HPC's Guidance on conduct and ethics for students.

Suggested documentation: Information as to how students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. This could include the possible addition of the HPC's Student guide to conduct and ethics in the indicative reading and support materials list for the module.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic radiographer) Robert Fellows (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	24 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Report from Strategic Health Authority Annual Quality Visit

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: From a review of the annual monitoring documentation the visitors note that both Charles Sloane and Ken Homes have both been referenced as programme leader at various points within the documentation during the academic period of 2009/2010. The visitors note that the HPC currently has Charles Sloane on record as programme leader. The visitors require clarification of the person who currently has overall professional responsibility for the programme and if this person has changed from Charles Sloan, evidence that they are appropriately qualified and experienced, and unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the register.

Suggested documentation: Conformation of the named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme and if changes have been made, evidence that they are appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the register.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-16	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Cumbria - BSc (Hons) DRAD - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-16	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Cumbria - BSc (Hons) DRAD - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Ann Green (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Placement and programme handbooks
 - Student complaints policy & process
 - Appendix I - of the business expansion plan
 - Adjudication information sheets C,E and F
 - Professional practice module descriptor

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: Through their review of the annual monitoring submission the visitors identified that there was a process in place for dealing with students' profession related conduct. However the visitors could not determine, from the information provided, what the outcomes of this process might be. It was identified in the documentation that 'Information sheet G: Sanctions to be applied where applicable' provides information about this but was not included in the documentation for this submission.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the sanctions which students may be subject to when going through this process. This could be included in the information sheet.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (Accelerated route)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational therapist) Tracy Clephan (Dietitian)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	24 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Appendix 1: Faculty Structure
 - Appendix 2: Quality Handbook for HE Provision. Academic Quality and Standards November 2010
 - Appendix 3: Letter from HPC Education Department dated 21 May 2010

- Appendix 4: Janice Bell short CV
- Appendix 5: Student Guide to the Complaints Process
- Appendix 6: Student Code of Conduct and Adjudication Procedure 2010/2011
- Appendix 7: Welcome Week Timetable September 2010
- Appendix 8: Module Descriptor Forms

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: The visitors have noted that the programme annual evaluatory report 2009/10 stated “Long term staff illness made it difficult to achieve the normal level of teaching, support and guidance for the new first year cohort” (8. Learning resources – Human resources). The visitors were concerned that the long term illness has affected the delivery of the programme and has had an impact on the effective delivery of the programme. The visitors were concerned that the absence of staff may have created additional pressures on the staff members. The visitors therefore require further information to ensure the programme team is able to manage the long term absence of staff and ensure there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Further information to detail how the programme team is managing the long term absence in staff. This could include information about staff member roles and how responsibilities are shared out between the programme team.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-20	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - Cumbria - MSc OT Accelerated Route - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-20	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - Cumbria - MSc OT Accelerated Route - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Exeter
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Medical Imaging (Diagnostic Radiography)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Christine Timms (Orthoptist)
HPC executive	Brendon Edmonds
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

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

- Module descriptors
- Continuing professional development opportunities
- Complaints procedure
- Fitness to practice procedures
- External examiner CV's

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-31	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - Exeter - BSc (Hons) DRAD - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted the programme leader had changed from Christine Heales to Karen Knapp. The visitors were satisfied the standards of education and training continue to be met in light of this change. However, due to the impact such a change has on the way standard of education and training 3.4 is met, the visitors noted this change should have been submitted via the major change process prior to or soon after the change had occurred for more immediate assessment by visitors.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-31	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - Exeter - BSc (Hons) DRAD - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Leicester
Programme title	Dip HE in Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner) Margaret Foster (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

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

- Diploma Advisory Group Minutes from April 2009, March 2010, July 2010, November 2010
- Board of Studies Minutes from November 2009, February 2010, May 2010, July 2010
- Staff Meeting Minutes from February 2010
- Module 1 Handbook
- Entry Requirements Proposal
- Partnership Agreement

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors were unclear as to the exact English level entry requirements for the programme. The annual monitoring report (AMR) 2008-2009 stated that applicants whose first language is not English must “demonstrate an achievement equivalent to IELTS [International English Language Testing System] Level 6.0.” (6. Amendments to programmes-d). Under the additional documentation section the document also stated “For Operating Department Practitioners this is equivalent to level 7.0 of the International English Language Testing System (IELTS). It is therefore appropriate that the entry requirements reflect this need.” (f). From this information the visitors were unable to determine whether the entry criteria had changed for the programme and to what it had changed to. The visitors therefore require clarification about the IELTS level required for entry to the programme and whether this has changed or not to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Clarification on the required IELTS level for entry to the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-20	e	EDU	RPT	AM report - Leicester - Dip HE ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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

Reason: From the documents provided the visitors noted the education provider has implanted a formal concerns procedure (standards of education and training mapping document SET 3.16). The evidence referred to for this standard included sections in the programme information book. The visitors noted that the education provider was aiming to reduce the incidence of early withdrawals. The visitors however were concerned that in cases that needed immediate actions such as cases of serious professional misconduct or misdemeanours the policies highlighted may be too lenient. The visitors were concerned that a student who has professional suitability issues may remain in contact with service users on placement for an extended length of time. As this is a new standard, the visitors require further information about the processes in place and evidence the education provider has processes in place to take immediate action if necessary, to ensure this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Further information regarding professional suitability procedures to reassure the visitors immediate action can be taken if necessary.

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

Reason: From the documents provided the visitors noted the education provider may have implemented a new placement audit form. The annual monitoring report (AMR) for 2008-2009 stated a follow up action had been to "review success of new placement audit form" (1.Summary of Action Points from 2007-2008 Report - g). The change to the placement audit form has not been reported to the HPC through major change or previous annual monitoring. No further information about the placement audit was provided in this annual monitoring submission. The visitors are concerned that if the placement audit form has changed it may no longer be appropriately ensuring the placements are suitable for students to use. The visitors therefore require further information about the placement auditing processes to ensure this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further information regarding the systems in place for placement auditing.

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

Reason: From the documents provided the visitors noted there were comments regarding the recruitment of a new external examiner for the programme. The standards of education and training mapping document stated no change had

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-20	e	EDU	RPT	AM report - Leicester - Dip HE ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

occurred to this standard, however it was unclear from the documents whether changes had occurred or not, “if we don’t get a new external examiner, the term of office....can be extended for another one year” (Board of Studies Minutes from February 2010). The visitors were uncertain whether the education provider had managed to recruit a new external examiner. The visitors were also uncertain whether, if a new external examiner had been recruited, the programme team had taken note of this standard and ensured there was a least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register unless other arrangements had been agreed. The visitors therefore require further information to ensure this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Clarifications about the external examiner arrangements for this programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors’ comments

The visitors wish to comment to the programme team that for future documentary submissions to the HPC they consider separating and clearly labelling sections of the documents in order that the documents are easier to navigate and information can more easily be located. The visitors also wish to comment that the programme team should ensure all documents are kept current and up-to date with the terminology and language used to avoid any confusion amongst students and external reviewers. The visitors noted in the Programme Information book published in March 2011, there was an inconsistency when it referred to the College of Operating Department Practitioners as the AODP when it also states that “the AODP became The College of Operating Department Practitioners in January 2007” (p3). There was also an error when they referred to the eligibility to apply for HPC registration (p24). Successful completion of the

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-20	e	EDU	RPT	AM report - Leicester - Dip HE ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Programme leads to eligibility to apply for HPC registration not eligibility to register.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-20	e	EDU	RPT	AM report - Leicester - Dip HE ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Orthoptics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Orthoptist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Christine Timms (Orthoptist)
HPC executive	Osama Ammar
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Student and placement evaluation forms
 - Student complaints procedure
 - Fitness to practise procedures 2010
 - HPC e-learning session 2010

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-31	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - Liverpool - BSc (Hons) OR - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	David Houliston (Biomedical scientist) Ann Green (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Placement document - including 'Unit descriptors'
 - Student handbook supplement
 - 2009 Course information leaflet

- Student complaints guidance and handbook of student regulations

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: The programme team have provided evidence in the documentary submission as to how students on the programme understand the 'Role of the HPC as holders of the Register of Health Care Professionals, including setting and maintaining standards for education, training, conduct, performance and ethics to protect the health of the public and investigating cases of misconduct.' However, the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensures that students understand the implications of HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Information as to how students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. This could include the possible addition of the HPC's Student guide to conduct and ethics in the indicative reading and support materials list for the unit.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed.

Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the education provider supplied very comprehensive documentation. However, they would like to point out that the comprehensive nature of the documentation was not conducive to the process of identifying how the programme continues to meet all of the relevant standards of education and training (SETs). Annual monitoring is a retrospective process which is intended to highlight how any changes to the programme may have affected how it continues to meet the SETs. Therefore the education provider only needs to submit the required documentation and any additional information which provides evidence of how any changes have affected how the programme continues to meet the standards. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider considers providing more succinct documentation in future to reduce the need for any unnecessary work.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Christine Timms (Orthoptist)
HPC executive	Brendon Edmonds
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Handbook of student regulations
 - Guide to student complaints policy and procedures
 - Staff placement handbook

- HPC SCPE's mapping
- Management of clinical concerns flowchart

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-31	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - Portsmouth - BSc (Hons) DRAD - 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: Visitors recommendation	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist) Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Staff Placement Handbook
 - Guide to Student Complaints Policy and Procedures
 - Handbook of Students Regulations

- Management of Clinical Concerns Flowchart
- Mapping Exercise of HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics
- Radiotherapy Capacity Report

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Visitors recommendation

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - Portsmouth BSc (Hons) TRAD - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme title	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
hMode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner) Margaret Foster (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Science Faculty Placement Handbook
 - Student Complaint Policy

- Handbook of Student Regulations
- Unit descriptor – Developing Professional Practice
- Unit descriptor – Professional Practice

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-20	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - Portsmouth - Dip HE ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors wish to comment to the programme team they felt the presentation of the documents to be exceptionally clear and easy to navigate which made their assessment of the submission very straightforward.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-20	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - Portsmouth - Dip HE ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Chiropodist/Podiatrist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Podiatrist) Susan Boardman (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of postal review	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - External Examiners report 2009
 - Periodic Programme Review 2002/3 - 2007/8
 - Programme Handbook 2010/11

- Module specification: Concepts in Health Care, Professional studies 1, Contexts of Professional Practice
- MEQ Summary report February 2011 and December 2010
- HPC Guidance on conduct and ethics for students

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-13	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - Salford - BSc (Hons) CH - FT & PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	5
Section five: Visitors' comments	5

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sheffield
Programme title	B.Med Sci (Hons) Speech
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist) Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Minutes of Teaching Committee, 12 May 2009 & 19 November 2009
 - CV's
 - First Year Student Handbook (BMedSci, BSc, MMedSci)
 - Minutes of Clinical Courses Board of Studies, 10 November 2009

- Learning and Teaching Annual Reflection, 2010-11

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: From the annual monitoring standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document submitted, the visitors were directed to the minutes of the Departmental Teaching Committee as evidence of how this standard is met. The SETs mapping documentation stated that the 'focal point for these activities is the Teaching Committee to which programme structure/curriculum changes, external examiner reports, student feedback and key reports for the wider university are submitted'. The visitors noted that a summary of the education provider's responses to the external examiners reports were incorporated into these minutes. However, from their review of the external examiners reports they could not correlate the comments made by the external examiners to the minutes. The visitors were therefore unclear if all the comments by the external examiners had been discussed or if detailed action plans had been agreed.

Section 6 of the minutes of the Departmental Teaching Committee (12 May 2009) stated that a paper had been circulated outlining the process for monitoring and responding to the yearly external examiner reports. The visitors did not receive a copy of this process.

To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors would like to receive further information about how the education provider acts upon the information gathered through its external examiners reports.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of how the information gathered through external examiner reports is acted upon.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: From the annual monitoring SETs mapping document submitted, the visitors were directed to pages 29-31 of the First Year Student Handbook as

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - Sheffield - BMed Sci SLT - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

evidence of how this standard is met. This document states on page 29 that ‘The Staff Student Committee is the key committee for you to get across your views about your degree programme and to influence decision making’. The visitors felt that this was not an appropriate process to deal with all students’ concerns about the programme or related services, or to raise concerns about harassment or discrimination. The visitors would therefore like to receive further information of the formal process in place for dealing with all student concerns about the programme and information about how this is communicated to students.

Suggested documentation: Further information about the formal process in place for dealing with student complaints.

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

Reason: From the annual monitoring SETs mapping document submitted, the visitors were informed that ‘A Fitness to Practice Panel was set up to meet once per semester from October 2009 onwards.’ However, from the documentation submitted the visitors could not identify the process for dealing with concerns about students’ profession-related conduct whether within the university or while on placements. In addition the visitors could not identify how students or practice placement providers were informed of the process. The visitors would therefore like to receive further information of how this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Further information about the formal process in for dealing with students’ profession-related conduct.

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

Reason: From the annual monitoring SETs mapping document submitted, the visitors learnt that ‘the Level 2 modules Language and Aphasia and Developmental Communication Sciences have both been restructured and reordered to allow for consolidation of previous learning from Level 1.’ The SETs mapping document directed visitors to page 2 of the Learning and Teaching Annual Reflection 2010-11. From this report and the Learning and Teaching Annual Reflection 2009-10, the visitors learnt about further changes to the assessment of clinical modules. The reports make reference to an ‘attached explanatory document’. However, the visitors did not receive a copy of this document or copies of the module descriptors affected. In summary from the evidence provided the visitors could not determine how the programme continued to ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet all the SOPs for their part of the Register.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	d	EDU	RPT	<i>AM report - Sheffield - BMed Sci SLT - FT</i>	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Suggested documentation: Documentation which shows how the learning outcomes for the programme ensure that all those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. This could be in the form of module descriptors.

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

Reason: From the annual monitoring standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document, the visitors were directed to module HCS403/6209 Transition to professional autonomy. The visitors noted that the HPC was taught as part of a two hour module which also included continuing professional development and an introduction to documents task. The assessment for this module was 'an assignment of 3000 words'. From their review of this module the visitors could not clearly identify how students would be taught about to ensure their understanding of the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors would therefore like to receive further information to ensure that this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Information which clearly shows how the education provider ensures students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. This could be in the form of module descriptors or copies of any presentation(s) or handouts that students receive that cover this area.

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

Reason: From the annual monitoring SETs mapping document submitted, the visitors learnt that 'the Level 2 modules Language and Aphasia and Developmental Communication Sciences have both been restructured and reordered to allow for consolidation of previous learning from Level 1.' The SETs mapping document directed visitors to page 2 of the Learning and Teaching Annual Reflection 2010-11. From this report and the Learning and Teaching Annual Reflection 2009-10, the visitors learnt about further changes to the assessment of clinical modules. The reports make reference to an 'attached explanatory document'. However, the visitors did not receive a copy of this document or copies of the module descriptors affected. In summary from the evidence provided the visitors could not determine how the assessment strategy and design for the programme continues to ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet all the SOPs for their part of the Register.

Suggested documentation: Documentation which shows how the assessment strategy and design for the programme ensure that all those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. This could be in the form of module descriptors.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	d	EDU	RPT	<i>AM report - Sheffield - BMed Sci SLT - FT</i>	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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

Reason: From the annual monitoring SETs mapping document submitted, the visitors learnt that ‘the Level 2 modules Language and Aphasia and Developmental Communication Sciences have both been restructured and reordered to allow for consolidation of previous learning from Level 1.’ The SETs mapping document directed visitors to page 2 of the Learning and Teaching Annual Reflection 2010-11. From this report and the Learning and Teaching Annual Reflection 2009-10, the visitors learnt about further changes to the assessment of clinical modules. The reports make reference to an ‘attached explanatory document’. However, the visitors did not receive a copy of this document or copies of the module descriptors affected. In summary from the evidence provided the visitors could not determine whether the assessment methods used continue to the learning outcomes of the programme.

Suggested documentation: Documentation which shows how the assessment methods employed continue to measure the learning outcomes for the programme. This could be in the form of module descriptors.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors’ comments

It may be helpful to future visitors scrutinizing this programme to receive new module descriptors where restructuring of content occurs together with tables showing the modules and credits per year and mapping to the standards of proficiency to ensure that all standards continue to be met.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-27	d	EDU	RPT	<i>AM report - Sheffield - BMed Sci SLT - FT</i>	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sheffield
Programme title	BMed Sci (Hons) Orthoptics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Orthoptist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Christine Timms (Orthoptist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	26 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Admissions information
 - Termination of placement policy
 - Changes to learning outcomes for specific modules
 - Student online placement evaluation

- Examination changes – paper from Unit teaching committee

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted the audit mapping referenced the Professional Behaviour (Year 1), Ethics (Year 2) and Role of Professional Regulation (Year 3) modules as evidence of meeting this standard. However the visitors were not provided module descriptors for these modules.

To be satisfied this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to submit these module descriptors. The module descriptors should clearly articulate how students are introduced and understand the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics through completion of these modules.

Suggested documentation: The visitors suggest the submission of the module descriptors for the above mentioned modules.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-14	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Sheffield - BMed Sci (Hons) OR - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-14	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Sheffield - BMed Sci (Hons) OR - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None