

## 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>	Birmingham City University
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-medical prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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
  - Self-Assessment programme monitoring report
  - NMC letter regarding minor modification

### 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.

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

**Reason:** In the external examiner report (2010-2011) the visitors noted a reference to changes that were made to the objective structured clinical examination (OSCE) “The assessment process for the OSCE within the non-medical programme was altered following discussion with the programme leader” (2.2 Assessment Processes, p.3). Within the submission, the visitors could not find any information about the change to the OSCE so were unable to determine whether the change had impacted on how this assessment measured the learning outcomes associated with it. The visitors therefore require further information in regards to this change to ensure this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information regarding the change to the OSCE referenced in the external examiners report (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.

## 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>	Birmingham City University
<b>Programme title</b>	Principles of Prescribing for Health Care Professionals
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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
  - Self-Assessment programme monitoring report
  - NMC letter regarding minor modification

### **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.

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

**Reason:** In the external examiner report (2010-2011) the visitors noted a reference to changes that were made to the objective structured clinical examination (OSCE) "The assessment process for the OSCE within the non-medical programme was altered following discussion with the programme leader" (2.2 Assessment Processes, p.3). Within the submission, the visitors could not find any information about the change to the OSCE so were unable to determine whether the change had impacted on how this assessment measured the learning outcomes associated with it. The visitors therefore require further information in regards to this change to ensure this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information regarding the change to the OSCE referenced in the external examiners report (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.

## 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 Birmingham
<b>Programme title</b>	Clinical Psychology Doctorate (ClinPsyD)
<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) Alison Nicholls (Dietician)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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
  - Education Commissioning for Quality (ECQ) ARM report 2010-11
  - Education Commissioning for Quality (ECQ) ARM action plan 2010-11

- Education Commissioning for Quality (ECQ) self assessment 2011-12
- Education Commissioning for Quality (ECQ) ARM proposed action plan 2012-13
- Two staff Curriculum Vitae

### **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 in their reading of the documentation and especially from the HCPC annual monitoring audit SETs mapping document, found that the education provider had reported enhancements to the programme. The visitors felt the evidence to support this, provided in the Education Commissioning for Quality (ECQ) ARM action plans, only provided the minimum of detail. The visitors would suggest that if such enhancements are reported in future, the education provider should consider whether supporting documentary evidence should be provided.

## 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 Bristol
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate of Educational 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>	Stephen Davies (Clinical psychologist) Judith Bamford (Educational psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 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>	Brunel University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Allan Winthrop (Counselling psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Nicola Baker
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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

The education provider also submitted the following:

- Placement management agreement
- Clinical placement handbook

- Complaints procedure
- Equal opportunities policy
- Admissions policy document
- Programme specification
- Module block outlines
- Professional Suitability Policy
- Senate Regulations 2, 4 and 6

### **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>	Brunel University
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Margaret Hanson (Occupational therapist) Catherine Mackenzie (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Tracey Samuel-Smith
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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
  - Curriculum vitae for Anne McIntyre

### **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>	Coventry University and Warwick University
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin.Psy)
<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) Alison Nicholls (Dietician)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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
  - Revised faculty structure within one of the education providers
  - Curriculum vitae for new member of programme staff

- Revised faculty fitness to practise 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.

### **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 Derby
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 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 Derby
<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>	Margaret Hanson (Occupational therapist) Catherine Mackenzie (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Tracey Samuel-Smith
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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 Derby
<b>Programme title</b>	MA Art Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full 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>	Philippa Brown (Art therapist) Jane Fisher-Norton (Dramatherapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of postal review</b>	11 February 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 Derby
<b>Programme title</b>	MA Dramatherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Arts therapist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Dramatherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Philippa Brown (Art therapist) Jane Fisher-Norton (Dramatherapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of postal review</b>	11 February 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 Derby
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Margaret Hanson (Occupational therapist) Catherine Mackenzie (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Tracey Samuel-Smith
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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 .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	De Montfort University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 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
  - Appeals against assessment board decisions
  - BIOM3020 Coterminus training module handbook
  - Handbook and regulations for undergraduate awards

- Registration portfolio
- Undergraduate Handbook and Course Guide
- Weblinks Document (hardcopies of weblinks referred to within documentation submitted)

### **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 wish to inform the programme team that they noted comments from the external examiners' report (D. Mernagh 2011-12) regarding internal moderation and marking in some of the units. The visitors noted the comments would be forwarded to the next meeting of the programme management board to be considered and responded to. The visitors consider this would be an appropriate action to take forward and support this motion.

## 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 Greenwich
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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
  - The School of Health & Social Care Assessment Policy Document 2011
  - Curriculum vitae for new external examiner J. Petter

### **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 within the SETs mapping document the programme team referenced a change to where information about students' progression and achievement is located in the programme documentation (SET 6.7). The visitors were content with the information provided as the information provided to students had not changed. However, they wish to highlight to the programme team that in future submissions to HCPC that it would be useful to include examples of what information is provided for students in addition to an outline of where it is included now, and was previously .

## 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 Greenwich
<b>Programme title</b>	Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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
  - The School of Health & Social Care Assessment Policy Document 2011
  - Curriculum vitae for new external examiner J. Petter

### **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 within the SETs mapping document the programme team referenced a change to where information about students' progression and achievement is located in the programme documentation (SET 6.7). The visitors were content with the information provided as the information provided to students had not changed. However, they wish to highlight to the programme team that in future submissions to HCPC that it would be useful to include examples of what information is provided for students in addition to an outline of where it is included now, and was previously .

## 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>	King's College London
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Dietitian
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Alison Nicholls (Dietitian)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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 report
  - NHS London contract quality monitoring reports 2009-10 and 2010-11
  - British Dietetic Association accreditation certificate
  - British Dietetic Association accreditation annual monitoring report 2012

- Staff curriculum vitae

### **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>	King's College London
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Allan Winthrop (Counselling psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Jamie Hunt
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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

The education provider submitted further documentation:

- Admissions documentation
- Information about practice placements, including audit tools
- Student handbooks

- Further programme information for current staff and students
- Stakeholder meeting information
- Module handbooks

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

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

### **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>	King's College London
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Dietetics
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Dietician
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Alison Nicholls (Dietician)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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 report
  - NHS London contract quality monitoring reports 2009-10 and 2010-11
  - British Dietetic Association accreditation certificate
  - British Dietetic Association accreditation annual monitoring report 2012

- Staff curriculum vitae

### **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>	King's College London
<b>Programme title</b>	Pg Dip Dietetics
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Dietician
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Alison Nicholls (Dietician)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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 report
  - NHS London contract quality monitoring reports 2009-10 and 2010-11
  - British Dietetic Association accreditation certificate
  - British Dietetic Association accreditation annual monitoring report 2012

- Staff curriculum vitae

### **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 .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Leeds
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
<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>	Stephen Davies (Clinical psychologist) Judith Bamford (Educational psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 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
  - Shortlisting guidelines (2012-2013)
  - Question and Answer sheet for prospective applicants to the programme

- Mentor scheme for trainee Clinical psychologists
- Attendance and leave taking policy (revised 2011)
- Curriculum vitae for clinical director, clinical tutors and programme assistant
- Placement 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.

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

The visitors noted that the education provider submitted exam results that identified students. Student exam results do not form part of the required documentation for HCPC annual monitoring. For future submissions, if the education provider wishes to submit exam results, the visitors suggest that this information be anonymised.

## 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>	Liverpool John Moores University
<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>	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 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>	Liverpool John Moores University
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Prescribing
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 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>	Liverpool John Moores University
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 7)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 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>	London Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Health psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Katie Thirlaway (Health psychologist) Tony Ward (Health and Counselling psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date postal review</b>	21 February 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
  - Internally Approved Course Logs
  - External Examiner Approval Form

### **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 College Plymouth St Mark and St John
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Margaret Hanson (Occupational therapist) Catherine Mackenzie (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Maria Burke
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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.

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

**Reason:** From the review of the documentation included with the annual monitoring audit form provided the visitors learnt of a change to the programme leader. The education provider has indicated that the programme leader has changed from Maggie Cooper to Julia Stewart. The visitors could not locate any further information within the submission regarding this change and were therefore unable to determine whether the named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced. The visitors would like to receive further information to ensure this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested documentation:** Curriculum vitae of the new programme leader.

### **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>	Metanoia Institute
<b>Name of awarding / validating body</b>	Middlesex University
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Counselling Psychology and Psychotherapy by Professional Studies (DCPsych)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part 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>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Allan Winthrop (Counselling psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Nicola Baker
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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

The education provider included:

- Placement handbook
- Placement questionnaire
- Codes and procedures handbook
- Programme handbook
- Admissions materials
- Response to HCPC Visitors' report June 2011
- Staff development policy
- Information for supervisors

### **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 .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Middlesex University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 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
  - Learning and quality enhancement handbook 2011-2012
  - Learning and quality enhancement handbook 2010-2011

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

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

### **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 that some concerns had been raised by students regarding computer access (Appendix 8a, Quality monitoring report 2010-2011, p47 and p52). The visitors want to highlight to the programme team that they should continue to monitor the concern to ensure any problems with resources can be resolved as necessary.

## 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>	Manchester Metropolitan University
<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>	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 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
  - Post Panel letter confirming ongoing-approval after an HCPC major change - May 2012
  - HCPC Closure of programme form: for information

### **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 .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Manchester Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Allan Winthrop (Counselling psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Jamie Hunt
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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.

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

The visitors noted the comments in the 'Continuous Monitoring and Improvement (CMI) Plan for 2012 – 2013' around the difficulties with the implementation and use of the centralised student unit evaluation system. The visitors are aware that an action plan has been produced for the academic year 2012-13 to address these issues. Whilst the visitors are content that the programme continues to meet the SETs they would like the education provider to consider the requirements around SET 3.3 when making changes to student feedback mechanisms. If the programme is required to make significant changes around how they continue to meet SET 3.3 then they should let the HCPC know through the major 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>	Manchester Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Psychology and Speech Pathology
<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>	Margaret Hanson (Occupational therapist) Catherine Mackenzie (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Maria Burke
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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
  - Unit descriptors
  - 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.

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted recommendations in the external examiner report for 2010 – 11 regarding the type of assessment that students were required to meet in the 'Practical Phonetics' module as well as the methodology for the weighting of marks. In response to the external examiners report the education provider indicated that these comments would be reviewed by January 2012. In particular the education provider highlighted that the assessment demand on students, as well as the type of assessment they would be subject to, would be addressed as part of the forthcoming programme review. The visitors were unable to locate any information within the annual monitoring submission to indicate whether these potential changes had been incorporated within the programme in the 2011 – 12 academic year. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the education provider has addressed these concerns as part of their evaluation and monitoring systems.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence which demonstrates how the education provider has addressed the suggestions received from the external examiner.

### 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 wished to point out that the comprehensive nature of the submission was not entirely conducive to coming to their decision. The annual monitoring process is a retrospective one focusing on changes not previously approved by the HCPC. The visitors noted that the submission contained information previously submitted and approved through the major change process. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that previously approved changes to an approved programme do not need to be submitted again through the annual monitoring process. The visitors would therefore like to highlight to the education provider that the volume of documentation submitted is not necessary for any future HCPC annual monitoring audit.

## 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>	Manchester Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Speech Pathology and 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>	Margaret Hanson (Occupational therapist) Catherine Mackenzie (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Maria Burke
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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
  - Unit descriptors
  - 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.

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted recommendations in the external examiner report for 2010 – 11 regarding the type of assessment that students were required to meet in the 'Practical Phonetics' module as well as the methodology for the weighting of marks. In response to the external examiners report the education provider indicated that these comments would be reviewed by January 2012. In particular the education provider highlighted that the assessment demand on students, as well as the type of assessment they would be subject to, would be addressed as part of the forthcoming programme review. The visitors were unable to locate any information within the annual monitoring submission to indicate whether these potential changes had been incorporated within the programme in the 2011 – 12 academic year. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the education provider has addressed these concerns as part of their evaluation and monitoring systems.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence which demonstrates how the education provider has addressed the suggestions received from the external examiner.

### 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 wished to point out that the comprehensive nature of the submission was not entirely conducive to coming to their decision. The annual monitoring process is a retrospective one focusing on changes not previously approved by the HCPC. The visitors noted that the submission contained information previously submitted and approved through the major change process. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that previously approved changes to an approved programme do not need to be submitted again through the annual monitoring process. The visitors would therefore like to highlight to the education provider that the volume of documentation submitted is not necessary for any future HCPC annual monitoring audit.

## 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>	Manchester Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Prescribing
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 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
  - Unit specifications for level 6 and 7.

### **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>	New College Durham
<b>Name of awarding / validating body</b>	Leeds Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Chiropodist / Podiatrist
<b>Relevant entitlements</b>	Local anaesthetic Prescription only medicine
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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

- Briefing paper of work placements
- Placement feedback report
- Minor modification forms for modules POD505, 507, 605

### **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>	New College Durham
<b>Name of awarding / validating body</b>	Leeds Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	Certificate in Local Analgesia
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Local anaesthetic
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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

The internal quality report, external examiners report, and response to external examiners report for two years ago were not provided as this programme did not run for the academic year 2010-2011.

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

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

### **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>	New College Durham
<b>Name of awarding / validating body</b>	Leeds Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	Prescription Only Medicine Certificate
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Prescription Only Medicine
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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

The internal quality report, external examiners report, and response to external examiners report for two years ago were not provided as this programme did not run for the academic year 2010-2011.

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

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

### **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 .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Nottingham
<b>Programme titles</b>	Top up Professional Doctorate in Forensic Psychology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Forensic psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	George Delafield (Forensic and Occupational psychologist) Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of postal review</b>	11 February 2012

### 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

Supporting documents mentioned in audit form:

- Course handbook

- Placement Handbook
- Information on placements
- Assignment Handbook for Years 2 & 3/Doctorate component
- Prospectus for the full Doctorate in Forensic Psychology. 'Full prospectus'
- Interview questions
- Interview written task
- Supervisor Training timetables
- Email from Head of School to confirm approval for new appointment

### **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 were satisfied that sufficient evidence has been presented to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training. The Visitors noted that the programmes continue to recruit a number of students in excess of the business plan but consider that the resources available are able to meet this demand.

## 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 Nottingham
<b>Programme titles</b>	Professional Doctorate in Forensic Psychology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Forensic psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	George Delafield (Forensic and Occupational psychologist) Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of postal review</b>	11 February 2012

### 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

Supporting documents mentioned in audit form:

- Course handbook

- Placement Handbook
- Information on placements
- Assignment Handbook for Year 1/MSc
- Assignment Handbook for Years 2 & 3/Doctorate component
- Prospectus for the full Doctorate in Forensic Psychology. 'Full prospectus'
- Interview questions
- Interview written task
- Supervisor Training timetables
- Email from Head of School to confirm approval for new appointment

### **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 were satisfied that sufficient evidence has been presented to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training. The Visitors noted that the programmes continue to recruit a number of students in excess of the business plan but consider that the resources available are able to meet this demand.

## 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 Nottingham
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 3)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Paul Blakeman (Podiatrist) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Maria Burke
<b>Date of postal review</b>	1 February 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
  - Fitness to Practice: Raising and Escalating concerns within Practice Learning Environments
  - Pre-Session reading: A rough guide to Law and Medicines 2012
  - Context Pack and Course reports from 2009-2010 and 2011 – 2012 which covers some of the above checked points.

### **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 Nottingham
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Prescribing (M Level)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Paul Blakeman (Podiatrist) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Maria Burke
<b>Date of postal review</b>	1 February 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
  - Fitness to Practice: Raising and Escalating concerns within Practice Learning Environments
  - Pre-Session reading: A rough guide to Law and Medicines 2012
  - Context Pack and Course reports from 2009-2010 and 2011 – 2012 which covers some of the above checked points.

### **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 Surrey
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) 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) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 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 Surrey
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (PsychD)
<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>	Stephen Davies (Clinical psychologist) Judith Bamford (Educational psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 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
- Standards of proficiency mapping document
- Course, placement and research handbooks

- Programme regulations
- Selection policy and trainee job description and person specification
- Placement audits, placement contracts and service level agreements
- Letter from the Dean
- Board of Studies, Cross Year Meeting and Executive Group minutes
- Education Commissioning for Quality documentation (spreadsheet)
- Programme team and honorary clinical tutors' Curriculum Vitae
- Timetables
- Consent to teaching form
- Service User and Carer Advisory Group minutes
- Knowledge Skills Framework (KSF) Booklet
- Major change documentation for placements
- New research model

### **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 wished to point out that the comprehensive nature of the submission was not entirely conducive to coming to their decision. The annual monitoring process is a retrospective one focusing on changes not previously approved by the HCPC. The visitors noted that the submission contained information previously submitted and approved through the major change process. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that previously approved changes to an approved programme do not need to be submitted again through the annual monitoring process. The visitors would therefore like to highlight to the education provider that to avoid any unnecessary work the volume of documentation submitted is not necessary for any future HCPC annual monitoring audit.

## 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>	Swansea University
<b>Programme title</b>	DipHE Paramedic Science
<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) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 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
  - Module pro forma for SHE213
  - Personal Tutor Policy (contained within Assessment & Progress section of the Academic Guide)
  - Curriculum vitae for programme leader

### **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>	Swansea University
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Prescribing
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 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:** The visitors noted that there had been internal changes to the education providers procedures for quality documents to be reviewed. Whilst the visitors received the internal quality audit document, they did not receive the external examiner report for 2011-2012 or the response to the report. The visitors require this document to review this document to ensure that the programme has regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

**Suggested documentation:** The external examiners report and response to the report for the academic session 2011-2012.

### **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.

## 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>	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) Alison Nicholls (Dietician)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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
  - Admissions documentation
  - Programme management documentation and curriculum vitae
  - Curriculum documentation

- Practice placement 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.

## 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 College London
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Audiological Science with Certificate in Clinical Competency (CCC)
<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>	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 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
  - Job description for the Director of Clinical Studies
  - Curriculum vitae for the newly appointed Director of Clinical Studies
  - Job description for a Clinical Audiologist (additional academic position)

- Curriculum vitae for the newly appointed Clinical Audiologist
- Updated list of audiological equipment for training available in the skills lab

### **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 that the programme was visited in the academic year 2010-2011. The visitors observed from the visitors report at that time a significant number of the SETs received conditions that were subsequently met. The visitors can see from the documentation received that there have been incremental increases to the level at which the threshold level of the SETs are being met since the visit and are encouraged that the programme is continuing to develop in this way. There are areas within the documentation provided that the visitors suggest the programme team keep under review to ensure they are resolving any concerns which may arise. The areas the visitors particularly noted were those in regards to equipment available to the programme, IT facilities and software version differences and concerns surrounding examination and portfolio results being released within a reasonable timeframe.

## 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 College London
<b>Programme title</b>	Postgraduate Diploma in Audiological Science with Certificate in Clinical Competency (CCC)
<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>	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	21 February 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
  - Job description for the Director of Clinical Studies
  - Curriculum vitae for the newly appointed Director of Clinical Studies

- Job description for a Clinical Audiologist (additional academic position)
- Curriculum vitae for the newly appointed Clinical Audiologist
- Updated list of audiological equipment for training available in the skills lab

### **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 that the programme was visited in the academic year 2010-2011. The visitors observed from the visitors report at that time a significant number of the SETs received conditions that were subsequently met. The visitors can see from the documentation received that there have been incremental increases to the level at which the threshold level of the SETs are being met since the visit and are encouraged that the programme is continuing to develop in this way. There are areas within the documentation provided that the visitors suggest the programme team keep under review to ensure they are resolving any concerns which may arise. The areas the visitors particularly noted were those in regards to equipment available to the programme, IT facilities and software version differences and concerns surrounding examination and portfolio results being released within a reasonable timeframe.

## 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>	Advanced Certificate Non Medical Prescribing
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	19 February 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
  - HCPC Post Panel letter for major change
  - 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 .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Central Lancashire
<b>Programme title</b>	Diploma of Higher Education 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>	David Bevan (Operating department practitioner) Steven Oates (Operating department practitioner)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Maria Burke
<b>Date of assessment day / postal review</b>	18 February 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

- Email January 26<sup>th</sup> 2012
- School of Health Student Handbook
- School of Health Guide to being a Personal Academic Tutor
- Supporting students with a Disability in Practice: Settings Best Practice Guide For Students, Academics and Practice Staff in Health and Social Care settings
- Module Descriptors NU1050 and NU2064

### **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 Campus Suffolk
<b>Name of awarding / validating body</b>	Universities of East Anglia and Essex
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
<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>	Russell Hart (Therapeutic radiographer) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of postal review</b>	8 February 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.