

---

## Annual monitoring 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>	Queens University of Belfast
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsych)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of postal review</b>	18 July 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Regent's University London
<b>Name of awarding / validating body</b>	The Open University
<b>Programme title</b>	Practitioner Doctorate in Existential Phenomenological Counselling Psychology (DPsych)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Counselling psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Tony Ward (Counselling psychologist) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Nicola Baker
<b>Date of postal review</b>	3 May 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

- This programme has only run for one year, and therefore previous external examiner reports and internal quality reports were 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.

---

## Annual monitoring 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>	St George's, University of London
<b>Programme title</b>	PG Practice Cert in Supplementary Prescribing (Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) members) Level 7 (formerly PG Practice Cert in Supplementary Prescribing (Health Professions Council (HPC) members) Level 7
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Brian Ellis (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

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

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

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the ‘Annual Programme Monitoring Report 2011-12’ (page 6) that a number of changes have been made to the specialist module Personal and Professional Development in Advance Practice in response to students’ feedback. The visitors also noted these changes to the specialist module are not mapped in the SETs mapping document as part of this annual monitoring process. The visitors could not determine whether these changes affect the learning outcomes and therefore whether they continue to ensure those who successfully complete the programme will meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information regarding the changes to the specialist module Personal and Professional Development in Advance Practice.

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

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

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

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

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

The visitors noted through this submission that the title of the programme has changed to 'Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) Members Level 6' to reflect the Health Professions Council (HPC) changing its name to the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC). This change will need to go through the Education department's programme records change process.

---

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	St George's, University of London
<b>Programme title</b>	Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) Members Level 6 (formerly Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing Health Professions Council (HPC) Members Level 6)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Brian Ellis (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

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

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

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the ‘Annual Programme Monitoring Report 2011-12’ (p6) that a number of changes have been made to the specialist module Personal and Professional Development in Advance Practice in response to students’ feedback. The visitors also noted these changes to the specialist module are not mapped in the SETs mapping document as part of this annual monitoring process. The visitors could not determine whether these changes affect the learning outcomes and therefore whether they continue to ensure those who successfully complete the programme will meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information regarding the changes to the specialist module Personal and Professional Development in Advance Practice.

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

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

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

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

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

The visitors noted through this submission that the title of the programme has changed to 'Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) Members Level 6' to reflect the Health Professions Council (HPC) changing its name to the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC). This change will need to go through the Education department's programme records change process.

---

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University Campus Suffolk
<b>Name of awarding / validating body</b>	Universities of East Anglia and Essex
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (v300)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Brian Ellis (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

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

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

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted the context pack had a completed major change notification form detailing changes to the assessment for this programme. This major change was referred to the annual monitoring process. In making changes to the assessment weighting, the education provider has introduced a new assessment method in the form of a practice assessment. The previous assessment method of an essay has been retained but the weighting has been reduced. This change in how the learning outcomes of the programme are assessed will have an impact on how the programme continues to ensure the standard of proficiency for this entitlement is met. The visitors could not determine from the documentation if this programme continues to meet the above SET. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that this programme continues to meet this SET.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information regarding the new assessment method in the form of a practice assessment.

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted the context pack had a completed major change notification form detailing changes to the assessment for this programme. This major change was referred to the annual monitoring process. In making changes to the assessment weighting, the education provider has introduced a new assessment method in the form of a practice assessment. The previous assessment method of an essay has been retained but the weighting has been reduced. This change in how the learning outcomes of the programme are assessed will have an impact on how the programme continues to ensure the assessment methods continue to measure the learning outcomes. The visitors could not determine from the documentation if this programme continues to meet the above SET. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that this programme continues to meet this SET.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information regarding the new assessment method in the form of a practice assessment.

#### **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:** The visitors noted in the documentation submitted the education provider has appointed a new external examiner for the programme. The visitors could not determine from the documentation if the new external examiner is from the relevant part of the Register or if other arrangements have been agreed. They therefore could not determine that the external examiner is appropriately qualified and experienced. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate this programme continues to meet this SET.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information regarding the new external examiner's qualifications and experience, such as a CV.

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

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

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

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

---

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Birmingham
<b>Programme title</b>	Applied Educational and Child Psychology (D.Ed.Psy)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Educational psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Trevor Holme (Educational psychologist) Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Hollie Latham
<b>Date of postal review</b>	1 August 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bradford
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Hollie Latham
<b>Date of postal review</b>	16 July 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Brighton
<b>Programme title</b>	Supplementary Prescribing (1)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Brian Ellis (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

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

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

**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:** The visitors noted in the documentation submitted the education provider has appointed a new external examiner for the programme. The visitors could not determine from the documentation if the new external examiner is from the relevant part of the Register or if other arrangements have been agreed. They therefore could not determine that the external examiner is appropriately qualified and experienced. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate this programme continues to meet this SET.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information regarding the new external examiner's qualifications and experience, such as a CV.

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

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

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

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

---

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Brighton
<b>Programme title</b>	Supplementary Prescribing (2)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Brian Ellis (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

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

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

**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:** The visitors noted in the documentation submitted the education provider has appointed a new external examiner for the programme. The visitors could not determine from the documentation if the new external examiner is from the relevant part of the Register or if other arrangements have been agreed. They therefore could not determine that the external examiner is appropriately qualified and experienced. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate this programme continues to meet this SET.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information regarding the new external examiner's qualifications and experience, such as a CV.

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

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

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

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

---

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Chester
<b>Programme title</b>	MA Art Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Arts therapist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Art therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist) Dianne Gammage (Drama therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of postal review</b>	3 July 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Cumbria
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Gail Stephenson (Orthoptist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

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

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

#### **6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.**

**Reason:** From their reading of the documentation the visitors were unsure how the assessment for the practice placement was moderated. The external examiner had also raised the issue in 2010 – 2011 and again in 2011 – 2012 academic years. For the visitors to be assured that this standard continues to be met they would like to receive further documentation that demonstrates how the assessment for the practice placement is moderated to ensure that student performance is objectively assessed to ensure student's fitness to practice.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence to demonstrate that the assessment for practice placement is moderated.

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

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

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

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

---

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of East Anglia
<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) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
<b>HPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of postal review</b>	1 August 2013

### 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
- 
- Final Report from UEA Programme Review November 2012
  - CSP Quality Assurance Mapping Document 2013/14
  - Programme Review Document 2012
  - Professional Development One Module Handbook
  - Minutes of the Annual Review Meeting with Partners 2011 and 2012.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of East Anglia
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Elspeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist) Lucy Myers (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Nicola Baker
<b>Date of postal review</b>	10 July 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Hull
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitor</b>	Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist) David C Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Hollie Latham
<b>Date of assessment</b>	6 August 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Hull
<b>Programme title</b>	DipHE Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Hollie Latham
<b>Date of postal review</b>	8 August 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

Appendices A – N:

A – Equal opportunities policy

B – Peer review policy

- C – PPQA evaluation of practice example
- D – Confirmation of programme lead change
- E – Staff profile
- F – Talis-Spire generated reading list
- G – Consent for clinical skills
- H – Staff profiles
- I – Programme management team minutes (part A. CODP.24)
- J – PPQA practice audit example
- K – PPQA mentorship register example
- L – Mentor update website
- M – Mentorship module specification
- N – Faculty subject booklet - ODP specific pages

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

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to 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 would like to advise the education provider for future reference that evidence already submitted and assessed as part of a major change in the audit period are not required again for the annual monitoring.

---

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Hull
<b>Programme title</b>	M Biomed Sci
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitor</b>	Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist) David C Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Hollie Latham
<b>Date of assessment</b>	6 August 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Leicester
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of postal review</b>	28 May 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Liverpool
<b>Programme title</b>	Pg Dip Radiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Therapeutic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Matthew Nelson
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Periodic review March 2012
  - Periodic review action plan

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

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

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

**Reason:** The visitors have reviewed the 'Periodic review action plan' and noted the comment: "It is hoped to have a full complement of staff in MIRT for the start of the academic year 2012/13" (recommendation 1). They also noted other comments within the submitted documentation referring to staff shortages and the subsequent impacts on students and their learning. In light of these comments, the visitors are concerned with how the programme continues to meet this standard and therefore require further information to ensure there is an appropriate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

**Suggested documentation:** Information regarding the current staffing levels and how the programme has responded to the Periodic review action plan 2012.

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

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of 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 through the documentation some concerns regarding the state of the physical facilities. The visitors appreciated that actions have been taken to address these issues. They are also aware that further actions may need to be undertaken. The visitors note the programme should ensure all the physical resources for the programme are fit for purpose.

---

## Annual monitoring 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 Manchester
<b>Programme title</b>	Educational and Child Psychology (D.Ed.Ch.Psychol)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Educational psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Trevor Holme (Educational psychologist) Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of postal review</b>	17 July 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

Additional relevant documentation was provided:

- Document 1 – ITEP contract project plan
- Document 2 – Risk analysis within ITEP contract schedule
- Document 3 – DEdChPsychol Regional Research Strategy 2012
- Document 4 – Regional Placement Allocation Co-ordinator and placement allocation system
- Document 5 – Programme organisation chart
- Document 6 – Programme staff CVs
- Document 7 – School of Education Workload Allocation Model
- Document 8 - Fieldwork handbook
- Document 9 – Electronic student record
- Document 10 – Register of Visiting Speakers
- Document 11 – Curriculum plan 2012
- Document 12 – Audit of curriculum content change 2010-2013.
- Document 13 – PBL self assessment framework
- Document 14 – Dr Jane Yeomans, HCPC web page confirmation of registration

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

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to 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 additional documentation provided by the education provider gave a very helpful account of the Consortium of training providers for which the University of Manchester is the lead HEI for the contract with the Teaching and Learning Agency. The visitors suggest for future HCPC approval and monitoring reviews the education provider include information on the workings of the consortium within the national training requirements for Educational Psychologists to assist visitors.

---

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Salford
<b>Programme title</b>	Prescription only Medicine for Podiatrists
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Prescription only Medicine
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Phil Mandy (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Emma Supple (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of postal review</b>	26 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- This stand-alone module has not run since the last Annual Monitoring Audit in 2010 – 2011, therefore there are no internal quality reports for one year ago 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.

---

## Annual monitoring 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 Sheffield
<b>Programme title</b>	BMed Sci (Hons) Orthoptics
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Orthoptist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Gail Stephenson (Orthoptist) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

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

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

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

**Reason:** From their reading of the documentation the visitors were unable to determine if the periodic review report covered the academic session 2010 – 2011 and 2011 – 2012 as there was no internal quality report for the period 2010 – 2011. The visitors therefore would like clarification to confirm whether the periodic review report relates to the 2010 – 2011 session.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence to clarify whether the periodic review report was submitted in place of an internal quality report for 2010 – 2011.

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

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

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

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