

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Bangor University
<b>Programme title</b>	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time accelerated
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Margaret Hanson (Occupational therapist) George Delafield (Forensic psychologist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	28 February 2012

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Document detailing evidence to support SET 4.5
  - Student grievance procedure

- Changes to the collaborative working arrangements between Bangor and Cardiff Universities
- Fitness to practise policies
- Programme monitoring and evaluation document

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

### Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted the documentation submitted for this annual monitoring indicated that the programme would be undergoing a revalidation in 2012. The 'Annual Review of Teaching and Learning 2010/11 and Development Plan for 2011/12' highlighted concerns around staff workload "as the OT staff are having to take on additional school wide roles" (p5). The visitors wish to remind the education provider that they will need to inform the HPC through the major change process if there are any changes made that will affect how the programme continues to meet the SETs. The visitors also

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

suggest that including information about staff workloads and roles in evidence submitted to support changes will be beneficial.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	British Psychological Society
<b>Programme title</b>	Qualification in Counselling Psychology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Flexible
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Counselling psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Anthony Powell (Physiotherapist) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	David Christopher
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	1 March 2012

### 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
  - There is no internal quality report for two years ago as prior to 2010-11 this was a bi-annual process
  - Job description and CV for the Lead Co-ordinator of Training

- CV for Chair elect of the Counselling Psychology Qualifications Board
- Appraisal forms used by those with roles in the qualification

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

### Section five: Visitors' comments

Through a consideration of the documentation provided the visitors noted that the education provider had submitted change notification forms which they had already submitted. The visitors would like the education provider to note that this is only necessary when the recommendation from the HPC is that the annual monitoring process is the best process to consider the changes. The visitors would also like the education provider to note that any changes that have already been considered through major change do not need to be resubmitted through annual monitoring. However, if the education provider feels that there are any changes in the way that the programme meets the standards of education and training, such as a change to the Lead Co-ordinator of Training, change notification forms should be submitted rather than using the annual monitoring process.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Institute of Psychiatry, King's College London
<b>Name of validating body</b>	King's College London
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	1 March 2012

### 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 Philosophy and Aims
  - Placement feedback forms

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Iron Mill Institute, Exeter
<b>Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)</b>	University of Worcester
<b>Programme title</b>	MA Drama Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Arts therapist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Dramatherapist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Jane Fisher-Norton (Dramatherapist) Paul Blakeman (Podiatrist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of postal review</b>	10 March 2012

### 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

- Validation Document
- Student Programme Handbook

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Keele University
<b>Programme title</b>	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	1 March 2012

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - The programme has only been running one year so there is only one year's annual monitoring available.
  - Student module handbook
  - Programme specification

- Competency book
- Module proforma
- Staff CV's from school of nursing and midwifery
- EBP slides and Ethics slides
- Audit of practice (PIRA) documentation
- Equity and diversity policy
- Module evaluation
- Student module evaluation
- Appeals process documentation
- Complaints process documentation
- Professional development policy school of nursing and midwifery
- Fitness to practice regulations
- Health and conduct committee terms of reference
- Mentor update training timetable
- Application form for prescribing modules

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence referenced in the completed SETs mapping document for this standard (taught session on ethical and professional principles, presentation slides included in this submission). The evidence submitted did not reference the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors considered the module did not specifically ensure students would fully understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors therefore require further information to demonstrate the programme curriculum ensures the students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

**Suggested documentation:** Further information about how the programme curriculum informs students of the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Nottingham Trent University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist) Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Victoria Adenugba
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	28 February 2012

### 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
  - IBMS Code of Conduct
  - Record of Informal Warning
  - BSc Biosciences Cluster Programme Committee minutes
  - Complaints Procedure for Students

- Student Code of Behaviour

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

#### 3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

**Reason:** From a review of the BSc Bioscience Cluster Programme Committee meeting minutes visitors noted a sentence which states that the 'BSc Applied Biomedical Science was phasing out'. The visitors were not provided with evidence to support and explain this statement and as such were unclear as to what changes, if any, had occurred and how the programme continues to meet this standard. Therefore the visitors require documentation which articulates the position the programme has in the education providers business plan and what effect, if any, the statements above have on how the programme continues to meet this SET.

**Suggested documentation:** Information regarding the programmes position in the education providers business plan any arrangements in place for 'phasing out' the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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

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

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

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

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

The Visitors' note from the additional documentation provided by the education provider that the local Strategic Health Authority (SHA) has decided not to fund the programme for further intakes of students. Therefore as a consequence of this the programme is to close.

The visitors also noted that current students in the second and third year continue to be funded by the SHA and that the University is committed to running this programme until all current students have completed their studies.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Queen Margaret University
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Art Psychotherapy (International)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Arts therapist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Art therapist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Jonathan Isserow (Art therapist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	1 March 2012

### 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

- Course document
- Placement handbook
- 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.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of 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.
2012-03-01	a	EDU	RPT	AM report QMU MSc ASAT FT PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Queen Margaret University
<b>Programme title</b>	Post Graduate Diploma (pre-registration) in Speech and Language Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist) Mary MacDonald (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Tracey Samuel-Smith
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	28 February 2012

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- The programme was visited in December 2009 and therefore documentation for two years ago is not available.

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of 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.
<del>2012-02-</del> <del>292012-02-</del> <del>292012-02-</del> 28	<del>aaeb</del>	EDU	RPT	<del>AM report - QMU - Pg Dip SLT -</del> <del>FTAM report - QMU - Pg Dip SLT -</del> <del>FTAM report QMU Pg Dip SLT FT</del>	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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Roehampton University
<b>Programme title</b>	MA Dramatherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Arts therapist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Dramatherapist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Gordon Burrow (Podiatrist) Jane Fisher-Norton (Dramatherapist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Victoria Adenugba
<b>Date of postal review</b>	7 February 2012

### 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
  - Increased hours letter for programme leader
  - Curriculum Vitae for new Senior Lecturer

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

**Reason:** There is a named person but it is unclear from the CV and details supplied how this person can effectively manage the programme as they appear to be employed full time by a NHS post as well as fulfilling 30 hours with the University.

**Suggested documentation:** Information regarding whether this person has been seconded from the NHS post to fulfil this temporary role and how the overall hours for this person are managed between the two posts

#### 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:** No documentation was provided about this person therefore the visitors cannot determine their suitability and whether they are appropriately qualified and experienced, or if they are from the appropriate part of the Register.

**Suggested documentation:** The CV of the external examiner which details their experience as a dramatherapist and their HPC registration number.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-19	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Roehampton - MA Dramatherapy - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

#### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-19	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Roehampton - MA Dramatherapy - 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Sheffield Hallam University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Practice Based Learning)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Work based learning
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Margaret Hanson (Occupational therapist) George Delafield (Forensic psychologist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	28 February 2012

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - New module descriptor - Independent study in occupational therapy
  - Original module descriptor - Independent study in occupational therapy

- Minor modifications form – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Practice Based Learning)

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Sheffield Hallam University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Practice Based Learning)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Work based learning
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Ben Potter
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	1 March 2012

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Sheffield Hallam University
<b>Programme title</b>	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist/podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	28 February 2012

### 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
  - Minor Modifications tracker
  - Paramedic Practice Proforma document
  - Paramedic Minor Modification February 2011
  - Underpinning Knowledge and Theories document
  - Scientific Basis for Paramedic Practice

- Student Complaints Procedure
- Student Fitness to Practise Regulations
- SET 4.5 PIP 1 0409 document

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-02-28	a	EDU	RPT	AM report - SHU - Dip HE PA - 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Teesside University
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	1 March 2012

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	The Robert Gordon University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist) Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Ben Potter
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	28 February 2012

### 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 regulations
  - Module descriptor for 'AS1999 Professional skills for biomedical scientists'
  - Student Placement Learning Contract

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

### Section five: Visitors' comments

Through their review of the documentation provided the visitors noted in the 'Annual course appraisal report 2009–10' that there was a statement which articulated that 'There is going to be the need for a complete overhaul of the Biomedical Science course over the next academic session...' due to potential lack of placement availability. The visitors also noted in the 'Annual course appraisal report 2010-11' that there was a statement which articulated that 33 students enrolled on to the course in Stage 1 and that this increase from 28 may mean that placements may not be available for 18% of them. The visitors have noted these concerns and would like the education provider to be aware that if any of these issues do transpire then they must be reported to the HPC through the major change process. In this way any necessary changes brought about by these issues can be assessed to ensure that the programme continues to meet all of the standards of education and training.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	The Robert Gordon University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiography
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic radiographer) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Victoria Adenugba
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	28 February 2012

### 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 CVs
  - Course Specification
  - Academic Regulations
  - RGU Radiography Consent Forms

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	The Robert Gordon University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Dietitian
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	1 March 2012

### 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
  - Copy of letter from HPC (25 August 2011) indicating approval of major change submission for the programme
  - Guide to academic quality procedures
  - Academic Quality Handbook
  - Diagram of Committee Structure
  - Student Complaints Procedure

- Academic Regulations
- Detailed Course Descriptor
- Misconduct Procedures
- Letters to providers of placements

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Essex
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Biomedical Sciences (Integrated)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist) Mary MacDonald (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Tracey Samuel-Smith
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	28 February 2012

### 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
  - Terms of reference professional suitability group
  - Curriculum vitae's of programme staff
  - Complaints procedure for students

- Role of the HPC presentation

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
<del>2012-02-29</del> <del>2012-02-29</del> <del>2012-02-28</del>	<del>aab</del>	EDU	RPT	<del>AM report - Essex - BSc (Hons) BS</del> <del>- FTAM report - Essex - BSc (Hons)</del> <del>BS - FTAM report Essex BSc BMS</del> <del>FT</del>	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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Essex
<b>Programme title</b>	Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist/podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	28 February 2012

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Student handbook
  - School's fitness to practice documentation
  - Postgraduate handbook
  - Monitoring systems summary
  - NMC 2011 review-validation 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.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of 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.
2012-02-28	a	EDU	RPT	AM report - Essex - 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 five: Visitors' comments .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Glamorgan
<b>Programme title</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist/podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	28 February 2012

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- The education provider has not recruited any students onto the programme for the academic year 2008 - 2009 and 2009 - 2010 and therefore has not submitted internal quality reports, External Examiner's reports or responses to External Examiner's reports.

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

#### 4.5 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 SETs mapping document the visitors noted that students are directed to the HPC website to refer to ethical standards. The visitors also noted reference to the programme timetable as evidence of compliance with this standard. The visitors noted that the timetable lists a number of sessions relating to professional law and ethics. However, there was no specific evidence of how the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were addressed. To be assured that this standard is met the visitors require a clear outline of how the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum.

**Suggested documentation:** A clear outline of how the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. 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.
2012-03-12	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Glamorgan - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors understand that this is a post-graduate programme. The documentation provided lacked clarity on how the SET requiring further information was addressed within the programme. This has now been addressed through the submission of additional documentation, the visitors suggest it would be helpful for future submissions if the programme considered how the mapping of standards could be addressed more clearly.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-12	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Glamorgan - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Lincoln
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist) Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Ben Potter
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	28 February 2012

### 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 and undergraduate regulations 2011-12
  - Programme staff CV's
  - University complaints and fitness to practice procedure
  - External verifiers summary reports for the IBMS certificate of competence

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

#### 3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

**Reason:** From a review of the standards of education (SETs) mapping document the visitors noted a sentence which states that the 'Programme is being taught out as documented'. The visitors also noted a sentence which states that there is going to be a 'School merger Jan 2012, new school in Faculty of Science'. However, in reviewing the rest of the documentation provided the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to clarify these statements. The visitors were not provided with evidence to support and explain these statements and as such were unclear as to what changes, if any, had occurred and how the programme continues to meet this standard. Therefore the visitors require documentation which articulates the position the programme has in the education providers business plan and what effect, if any, the statements above have on how the programme continues to meet this SET.

**Suggested documentation:** Information regarding the programmes position in the education providers business plan, any transitional arrangements for changes of faculty or school and any arrangements in place to 'teach out' the programme.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document the visitors noted a sentence which states that there is, or has been, a 'New Head of School, New Head of College, [and] Changes planned to programme team'. The visitors were not provided with evidence to support and explain this statement and as such were unclear as to what changes, if any, had occurred and what effect these changes may have had on how the programme is effectively managed. Therefore the visitors require documentation which articulates what the planned changes to the programme team are, or have been, and what effect, if any, these changes have on how the programme continues to meet this SET.

**Suggested documentation:** Information regarding the structures in place to manage the programme and clarification of what effect any changes have had on these management arrangements.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-16	a	EDU	RPT	AM report Lincoln BSc - ABMS FT & PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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

**Reason:** From a review of the standards of education (SETs) mapping document the visitors noted a sentence which states that there is, or has been, a 'New Head of School, New Head of College, [and] Changes planned to programme team'. The visitors were not provided with evidence to support and explain this statement and as such were unclear as to what changes, if any, had occurred and what effect these changes may have had on the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme. Therefore the visitors require documentation which articulates what the planned changes to the programme team are, or have been, and what effect, if any, these changes have on how the programme continues to meet this SET.

**Suggested documentation:** Information regarding the staffing of the programme team and clarification of what effect any changes have had on the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff delivering the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-16	a	EDU	RPT	AM report Lincoln BSc - ABMS FT & PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

#### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

#### Section five: Visitors' comments

The Visitors' note from the additional documentation provided by the education provider that the local Strategic Health Authority (SHA) has decided not to fund the programme for further intakes of students. Therefore as a consequence of this the programme is to close.

The visitors also noted that current students continue to be funded by the SHA and that the University is committed to running this programme until all current students have completed their studies.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-16	a	EDU	RPT	AM report Lincoln BSc - ABMS FT & PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Plymouth
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Dietitian
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychology) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	1 March 2012

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Fitness to Practice policy document
  - Student Complaints Procedure
  - Student Disciplinary Procedure
  - Programme committee minutes
  - BSc (Hons) Dietetics Programme Handbook for 2010-2011
  - HPC Change Notification Form

- CV for Avril Collinson

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Plymouth
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	David Christopher
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	1 March 2012

### 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 Handbook 2010-2011
  - Fitness to practice procedures for students
  - Student disciplinary procedures

- Student complaints procedures

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of 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.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Wales Institute Cardiff
<b>Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)</b>	University of Wales
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist) Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Ben Potter
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	28 February 2012

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

- Module descriptors
- New and contributory staff CV's
- Programme team re-organisation document

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

### Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted from a review of this submission that the education provider has had an increase of student numbers. The visitors also noted that as a result of the reduction in staff on the programme team there has been a reallocation of workload to manage this. The visitors are satisfied that the programme still meets all the SETs however there is a possibility for the increase of student numbers to have an effect on how the programme team continues to deliver the programme. The visitors would like the education provider to note that they should continue to inform the HPC of any changes they make to the programme using the major change and annual monitoring processes.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Wales Institute Cardiff
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition and Dietetics
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Dietitian
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	1 March 2012

### 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
  - Web information regarding entry requirements
  - Course specific academic requirements and code of conduct
  - Course changes mapping document
  - B and C learning outcomes

- Revised monitoring form
- Placement retrieval scheme documentation
- Students complaints procedure
- Module descriptors

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

### Section five: Visitors' comments

From a review of the audit documentation the visitors noted the admissions criteria have changed for the 2012 – 2013 entry. The visitors noted the changes were triggered by the requirement to defer 4 students in 2011 because too many students satisfied the entry requirements for the commissioned places on the programme. The visitors noted these changes fall outside of this annual monitoring review which covers the academic years 2009 – 2010 and 2010 – 2011. The visitors recommend the education provider continue to monitor the situation and include an update in the next annual monitoring audit in 2013 – 2014.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Wales Institute Cardiff
<b>Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)</b>	University of Wales
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist) Mary MacDonald (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Tracey Samuel-Smith
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	28 February 2012

### 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

- Academic handbook including evaluation of academic programmes, periodic and elective review of existing programmes, complaints and appeals, student's complaints procedure
- Curriculum vitae's of programme team
- Regulation handbook
- Module modification documentation

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
<del>2012-02-</del> <del>292012-02-</del> <del>292012-02-</del> 28	<del>aaeb</del>	EDU	RPT	<del>AM report - UWIC - BSc (Hons)</del> <del>SLT - FTAM report - UWIC - BSc</del> <del>(Hons) SLT - FTAM report - UWIC</del> BSc 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Wales Institute Cardiff
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Dietetics
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Dietitian
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	1 March 2012

### 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 Retrieval Scheme Document
  - Student Complaints Procedure
  - Student Fitness to practice Document
  - Code of Conduct for Students
  - Module Descriptor for Applied Research
  - BDA Accreditation Certificate

- Professional Studies Module Descriptor
- Revised Learning Outcomes Document

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

#### 4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

**Reason:** From a review of the audit documentation the visitors noted comments within the external examiner report for 2010 – 2011, it was stated “the programme would be more relevant to practitioners if a wider range of modules were offered to reflect the diverse roles of dietitians both in the NHS and industry”. The visitors noted that the external examiner’s comment is linked to this standard, ensuring the curriculum remains relevant to current practice. The visitors also noted that the external examiner’s comment was highlighted as an area for development within the programme team’s response to the external examiner’s comments. However, the visitors were unable to find evidence of any formal response to the external examiners comments. The visitors therefore require further evidence of any formal response that was made in relation to the external examiner’s comments, any associated action planning or any evidence of where the comments have been integrated into quality monitoring and enhancement mechanisms.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence of any formal response that was made in relation to the external examiner’s comments, any associated action planning or any evidence of where the comments have been integrated into quality monitoring and enhancement mechanisms.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-16	a	EDU	RPT	AM report UWIC MSc - DT - 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.
2012-03-16	a	EDU	RPT	AM report UWIC MSc - DT - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Wales Institute Cardiff
<b>Programme title</b>	Pg Dip Dietetics
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Dietitian
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	1 March 2012

### 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 Retrieval Scheme Document
  - Student Complaints Procedure
  - Student Fitness to practice Document
  - Code of Conduct for Students
  - Module Descriptor for Applied Research
  - BDA Accreditation Certificate

- Professional Studies Module Descriptor
- Revised Learning Outcomes Document

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

#### 4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

**Reason:** From a review of the audit documentation the visitors noted comments within the external examiner report for 2010 – 2011 where it was stated “the programme would be more relevant to practitioners if a wider range of modules were offered to reflect the diverse roles of dietitians both in the NHS and industry”. The visitors noted that the external examiner’s comment is linked to this standard, ensuring the curriculum remains relevant to current practice. The visitors also noted that the external examiner’s comment was highlighted as an area for development within the programme team’s response to the external examiner’s comments. However, the visitors were unable to find evidence of any formal response to the external examiners comments. The visitors therefore require further evidence of any formal response that was made in relation to the external examiner’s comments, any associated action planning or any evidence of where the comments have been integrated into quality monitoring and enhancement mechanisms.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence of any formal response that was made in relation to the external examiner’s comments, any associated action planning or any evidence of where the comments have been integrated into quality monitoring and enhancement mechanisms.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-16	a	EDU	RPT	AM report UWIC Pg Dip - DT - 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.
2012-03-16	a	EDU	RPT	AM report UWIC Pg Dip - DT - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Wales Institute Cardiff
<b>Programme title</b>	Pharmacology (PR)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Prescription only medicine
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Lewis Roberts
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	28 February 2012

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - The education provider has offered this module only once in April 2009 and therefore has not submitted internal quality reports, External Examiner's reports or responses to External Examiner's reports for the academic years 2009 – 10 and 2010 – 11.
  - Student handbook

- Pharmacology module description
- Course evaluation questionnaire
- Complaints and appeals policy

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

**Reason:** From a review of the audit documentation the visitors noted that the Pharmacology (PR) module descriptor emphasised that the award is only open to HPC registered podiatrists with local anaesthetics certificate. As a result of this concerns over a student's profession related conduct would result in failure. However, the visitors noted that they were not provided with evidence of a formal process for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. Therefore visitors require further evidence of how this standard is met to ensure that there is a process in place for dealing with concerns about a students' profession-related conduct. In this way to ensure that any decision to fail a student is consistent, fair and open and that any such decisions can be justified to avoid any potential appeal. The visitors also require evidence that demonstrates that the policies and processes allow a student to address any issues relating to their conduct.

**Suggested documentation:** Student profession-related conduct procedures.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-02-28	a	EDU	RPT	AM report - UWIC - POM - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

#### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-02-28	a	EDU	RPT	AM report - UWIC - POM - 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Worcester
<b>Programme title</b>	FD in Pre Hospital Unscheduled and Emergency Care
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Jonathan Isserow (Art therapist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	1 March 2012

### 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 Practise Procedure
  - Complaints Procedure
  - Module Outline
  - Programme Specification

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-01	a	EDU	RPT	AM report Worc Fd PA 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Worcester
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (Level 6)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Victoria Adenugba
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	1 March 2012

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Module Outline
  - Guidance for Medical Supervisors
  - Fitness to Practise Procedure
  - Complaints Procedure

- CV External Examiner
- Course Leader CVs
- Competency document
- NMC Approval letter, report and notes of meeting

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Worcester
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (Level 7)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement(s)</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Victoria Adenugba
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	1 March 2012

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Module Outline
  - Guidance for Medical Supervisors
  - Fitness to Practise Procedure
  - Complaints Procedure

- CV External Examiner
- Course Leader CVs
- Competency document
- NMC Approval letter, report and notes of meeting

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	York St John University
<b>Programme title</b>	BHSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Margaret Hanson (Occupational therapist) George Delafield (Forensic psychologist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	28 February 2012

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Policy and Procedures: Student standards (attendance and course participation)

- Policy and Procedures: Student complaints
- Policy and Procedures: Health and conduct in respect to fitness to practice
- Policy and Procedures: Code of discipline for disciplinary procedures
- Professional practice placement handbook
- Letter from Yorkshire and Humber SHA to YSJU re: contract reviews

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

### Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted there was some concern with the number of students who progress with multiple failures at each level of the programme (Programme Evaluation BHSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy – full time 2010-2011). The visitors note this is due to the education provider regulations and so affects the full time and the part time in service modes of study. The visitors encourage the programme team to review progression policies in light of the professional nature of this programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	York St John University
<b>Programme title</b>	BHSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time (In Service)
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Margaret Hanson (Occupational therapist) George Delafield (Forensic psychologist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	28 February 2012

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Policy and Procedures: Student standards (attendance and course participation)

- Policy and Procedures: Student complaints
- Policy and Procedures: Health and conduct in respect to fitness to practice
- Policy and Procedures: Code of discipline for disciplinary procedures
- Professional practice placement handbook
- Letter from Yorkshire and Humber SHA to YSJU re: contract reviews

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

### Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted the programme evaluation reports for 2009-2010 and 2010-2012 highlighted the module – 2OT460 Work based enquiry learning, as being challenging for both staff and students. There have been some changes made to the module however the quality report for 2010-2011 indicates there may still be difficulties with this module that need monitoring. The visitors wish to encourage the education provider to continue to review this module and make amendments where necessary to improve the student learning.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

The visitors also noted there was some concern with the number of students who progress with multiple failures at each level of the programme (Programme Evaluation BHSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy – full time 2010-2011). The visitors note this is due to the education provider regulations and so affects the full time and the part time in service modes of study. The visitors encourage the programme team to review progression policies in light of the professional nature of this programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	York St John University
<b>Programme title</b>	BHSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Ben Potter
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	1 March 2012

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Professional practice handbook
  - Student complaints procedure
  - Course participation regulations
  - Students standard review procedures
  - Policy for student health and conduct

- Code of discipline for students and disciplinary procedures
- Staff CV's
- Letter from Yorks and Humber SHA

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None