

## Annual 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 College London
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Audiology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Hearing aid dispenser
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Liz Ross (Hearing aid dispenser) Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of postal review</b>	18 October 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form where available
  - 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
- Job Description – Director of Clinical Studies (DCS)
  - Curriculum vitae for Priya Singh – DCS
  - Curriculum vitae for Bridgitte Harley
  - Updated list of audiological equipment for training

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

**Reason:** From a review of the external examiners' report June 2013 the visitors noted comments made by the external examiner that emphasis was not given to inclusion of social care model of client care. The visitors did not see a response to the external examiners comment within the Chair's report.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence to demonstrate how this comment from the external examiner was addressed within the programme.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Birmingham
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Flexible
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Hollie Latham
<b>Date of postal review</b>	4 September 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.

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the external examiners have raised the issue of inconsistency in marking and feedback to students. It is clear from the documentation provided that the feedback has been recognised by the education provider and responded to. However, the visitors were unable to find evidence of the outcome of such discussions and therefore the effectiveness of the current monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place.

**Documentation:** Further documentation is required to demonstrate how these suggestions have been implemented to ensure that criteria are applied consistently and that it is appropriate to the programme, the students' progression and making sure that students can meet the standards of proficiency when they complete the programme.

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Central Lancashire
<b>Programme title</b>	Dip HE Paramedic Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full Time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Gordon Pollard (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Matthew Nelson
<b>Date of postal review</b>	30 October 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
  - External Examiner's report, and response, for 2012 - 13
  - Module Catalogue
  - Programme Specification
  - Course Handbook 2013 - 14
  - School of Health Student Handbook 2013 - 14
  - School of Health Manual 2012 – 2013
  - School of Health Assessment Handbook 2013 - 2014

### **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 on-going 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 Manchester
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Counselling Psychology
<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) Allan Winthrop (Counselling psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Hollie Latham
<b>Date of postal review</b>	3 October 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
  - External Examination Board agendas for 2010/11, 2011/12 and 2012/13
  - Covering letter for assessor
  - Staff CV's
  - Management structure
  - 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.

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

**Reason:** The annual monitoring audit form states that the core staff team has changed. Whilst most of the team are qualified counselling psychologists, the visitors have noted that there may be some inexperience in terms of supervising doctoral research. The visitors noted that the handbook states “The Programme is supported by colleagues throughout the School of Education” including “The Counselling courses staff”, but it is not clear from the audit form to what extent these staff have input to the programme. The visitors will need evidence of the current resourcing strategy for the programme to determine that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place in to deliver the programme effectively.

**Documentation:** The education provider is encouraged to provide any appropriate supporting evidence, which could include a list of available research supervisors and their specialist interests, and teaching schedules for the current year to show how staff delivering the programme, teach to their specialist expertise and knowledge.

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

**Reason:** The annual monitoring audit form states that the core staff team has changed. Whilst most of the team are qualified counselling psychologists, the visitors have noted that there may be some inexperience in terms of supervising doctoral research. The visitors noted that the handbook states “The Programme is supported by colleagues throughout the School of Education” including “The Counselling courses staff”, but it is not clear from the audit form to what extent these staff have input to the programme. The visitors will need evidence of the current resourcing strategy for the programme to ensure that there is sufficient staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver the programme.

**Documentation:** The education provider is encouraged to provide any appropriate supporting evidence, which could include a list of available research supervisors and their specialist interests, and teaching schedules for the current year to show how staff delivering the programme, teach to their specialist expertise and knowledge.

#### **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.