

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

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme title	FDS in Hearing Aid Audiology
Mode of delivery	Distance learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist) Liz Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Louise Devlin
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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
 - CVs for new staff

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 has recently submitted a major change in regards to the appointment of Vinaya Manchaiah as programme leader. As the annual monitoring process is retrospective, looking at changes in the 2011–12 and 2012–13 academic years, this more recent change is currently being reviewed separately through the major change process.

The visitors also noted a comment in the response to the external examiner report (October 2013) that the programme team are “reviewing [their] processes for work-based assessment to confirm that [they] are compliant and to determine if [they] can do more to improve the student learning and assessment”. This was in response to the external examiner comment regarding the workplace supervisor being required to sign-off their own student’s progress of practical learning. In light of this review of processes, the visitors would like to remind the education provider that, if there are any changes to the way in which HCPC standards continue to be met, in particular SET 6.5, a major change notification form should be submitted to the HCPC.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Bangor University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Derek Adrian-Harris (Diagnostic radiographer) Gail Stephenson (Orthoptist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	Bangor University
Programme title	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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 Reports Requiring Feedback
 - QA 1 Report 2011-12
 - QA 1 Report 2012-13
 - External Examiner CV

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

Name of education provider	Birmingham Metropolitan College
Name of awarding / validating body	Aston University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Local anaesthetic Prescription only medicine
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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 mapping document provided stated that no changes had been made to the assessment methods. However from the Internal Annual Monitoring Report 2012/2013 the visitors noted that there had been changes made to the assessment methods. Although the visitors were able to locate the changes in the documentation provided, it was highlighted that such a significant change should be noted in the SETs mapping document. The visitors would recommend that future changes of a similar nature and scale are submitted 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 one: Programme details

Name of education provider	British Psychological Society
Programme title	Qualification in Counselling Psychology
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Counselling psychologist
Name and profession of HCPC visitor	Maureen Henderson (Dietician) Anthony Ward (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	19 February 2014

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 Candidate Handbook and Supervisor Handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: From the visitors reading of the documentation submitted for this audit, the visitors read that in the external examiner report 2013 (page 1) that the same modules in the past two years have been submitted to the external examiner for scrutiny. The response to this finding, from the board, was that in future different units will be selected so that the external examiner will be able to see a range of units and make their decision based on a broader range of units undertaken by students. In order for the visitors to be assured that the programme continues to meet this standard and be monitored and evaluated effectively they would like to see evidence to demonstrate how this change, to randomly select modules to be submitted to the external examiner, will be implemented.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of how the programme team will ensure a random sample of modules will be submitted to the external examiner each year for scrutiny.

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

Name of education provider	British Psychological Society
Programme title	Qualification in Forensic Psychology (Stage 2)
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Forensic psychologist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Nicola Bowes (Forensic psychologist) Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of postal review	25 March 2014

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 that there are likely to be a significant number of staffing changes throughout this academic year 2013-14, for example, the Annual Monitoring Summary Report (November 2013) details a number of upcoming changes to the board membership (page 5) As this annual monitoring audit covers changes made in the previous two academic years, the visitors were satisfied that there had been no changes to the way the SETs have been met in this period.. However, the visitors would like to remind the education provider that if there are any current and future significant changes to staffing, the HCPC should be informed about these changes through the major change process.

The visitors also noted that the Regulations for the Society's postgraduate qualifications have been revised, and are valid from February 2014. As this annual monitoring audit covers changes made in the previous two academic years, the visitors were satisfied that there had been no changes to the way the SETs have been met in this period. However, the visitors would like to remind the education provider that if changes to these regulations have an impact on the ways in which the SETs are met, in particular SET 6 Assessment, the education provider should submit a major change notification form to the HCPC.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	The British Psychological Society
Programme title	Qualification in Sport and Exercise Psychology (Stage 2)
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Sport and exercise psychologist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Rhonda Cohen (Sport and exercise Psychologist) Sandy Wolfson (Sport and exercise psychologist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of postal review	5 February 2014

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

Other documentation:

- Action Plans 2103, 2012

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Buckinghamshire New University
Programme title	Dip (HE) Operating Department Practitioner
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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 Descriptors
 - ODP Programme Specification

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Cardiff Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist) David Packwood (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	Cardiff Metropolitan University
Name of validating body	University of Wales
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist) David Packwood (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	Cardiff Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Alison Wishart (Podiatrist) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	27 February 2014

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
- Programme Overview and Level 4 Handbook 2013 (combination of 2 previous documents)

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted the submission included comments about the staffing levels for the programme. The SETs mapping document states that two members of staff retired in 2011 and one new member of staff has now been appointed (September 2013) (SET 3.5). The visitors noted the external examiner report (2011 – 2012) had comments about the staffing; “12 months after the retirement of two experienced members of staff there has been no appointment of full-time appointments” (section 6.2). The visitors noted they had no information regarding student numbers for the programme. The visitors can see there has been some response to the loss of staff however due to the emphasis on staffing concerns raised, are concerned there may not be an adequate number of appropriate staff in place to continue to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Information about the staffing levels of the programme including how the programme ensures there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Cardiff Metropolitan University
Name of validating body	University of Wales
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Alison Wishart (Podiatrist) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	27 February 2014

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
 - Programme Overview and Level 4 Handbook 2013 (combination of 2 previous documents)

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted the submission included comments about the staffing levels for the programme. The SETs mapping document states that two members of staff retired in 2011 and one new member of staff has now been appointed (September 2013) (SET 3.5). The visitors noted the external examiner report (2011 – 2012) had comments about the staffing; “12 months after the retirement of two experienced members of staff there has been no appointment of full-time appointments” (section 6.2). The visitors noted they had no information regarding student numbers for the programme. The visitors can see there has been some response to the loss of staff however due to the emphasis on staffing concerns raised, are concerned there may not be an adequate number of appropriate staff in place to continue to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Information about the staffing levels of the programme including how the programme ensures there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of postal review	19 March 2014

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

- Service user and carer job description
- NLIAH Contract Review
- Programme handbook section
- Academic Regulations handbook
- Trainee Committee minutes

- Supervisor Committee minutes
- DClin Psy Scheme Examination Requirements

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

Name of education provider	Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)
Programme title	Doctorate in Educational Psychology (DEdPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Peter Branston (Educational psychologist) Trevor Holme (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of postal review	17 April 2014

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
 - Teaching and Learning Handbook 2013-2014
 - Timetables, Schedules, Checklists and Standard Forms Handbook (TSCSF Handbook) 2013-2014
 - Team Development Meeting Agenda 14 November 2013
 - Team Development Meeting Agenda 20 March 2014

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)
Programme title	Postgraduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Derek Adrian-Harris (Diagnostic radiographer) Gail Stephenson (Orthoptist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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 were satisfied that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). However, the visitors wished to note that the generic nature of the documentation submitted for all three programmes (BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging), BSc (Hons) Radiography (Radiotherapy and Oncology) and BSc (Hons) Radiography (Radiotherapy and Oncology) incorporating bridging course) was not entirely conducive to come to their decision. The visitors articulated that the education provider should consider submitting documentation tailored to each programme separately for future HCPC annual monitoring audits. Additionally, providing clearly articulated information to evidence the links between the above programmes would be useful to help evidence that the SETs continue to be met.

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

Name of education provider	City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Radiotherapy and Oncology)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Julia Cutforth (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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

- Board of Studies amendment form - Radiography January 2014
- Cross Mapping - QAA + SCoR – Radiotherapy
- HCPC SOPS cross mapping - 2013 update
- Programme Committee Minutes 13 November 2013

- Programme specification - BSc (Hons) Radiography (Radiotherapy and Oncology) - 13-14
- Programme specification - BSc (Hons) Radiography (Radiotherapy and Oncology) - 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 that the education provider has mapped the curriculum and learning outcomes of this programme to the revised standards of proficiency (SOPs) for Therapeutic radiography. While the visitors recognise the work that has been undertaken to map the curriculum and learning outcomes to the new SOPs, they would like the programme team to note that this annual monitoring audit covers the 2011–12 and the 2012–13 academic years and the revised SOPs were published in May 2013. Therefore the visitors have not considered any changes to the programme that have resulted from the implementation of the new SOPs in this annual monitoring audit. Any changes to the programme which are made as a result of the implementation of the revised SOPs will be considered as part of the programme's next annual monitoring audit in the 2015–16 academic year.

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

Name of education provider	City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Radiotherapy and Oncology) incorporating bridging course
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Julia Cutforth (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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

- Board of Studies amendment form - Radiography January 2014
- Cross Mapping - QAA + SCoR – Radiotherapy
- HCPC SOPS cross mapping - 2013 update
- Programme Committee Minutes 13 November 2013

- Programme specification - BSc (Hons) Radiography (Radiotherapy and Oncology) - 13-14
- Programme specification - BSc (Hons) Radiography (Radiotherapy and Oncology) - 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 that the education provider has mapped the curriculum and learning outcomes of this programme to the revised standards of proficiency (SOPs) for Therapeutic radiography. While the visitors recognise the work that has been undertaken to map the curriculum and learning outcomes to the new SOPs, they would like the programme team to note that this annual monitoring audit covers the 2011–12 and the 2012–13 academic years and the revised SOPs were published in May 2013. Therefore the visitors have not considered any changes to the programme that have resulted from the implementation of the new SOPs in this annual monitoring audit. Any changes to the programme which are made as a result of the implementation of the revised SOPs will be considered as part of the programme's next annual monitoring audit in the 2015–16 academic year.

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

Name of education provider	City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitor(s)	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - BSc Programme Handbook
 - BSc Clinical Handbook
 - Division of Language and Communication Science Staff 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 the education provider has appointed new external examiners for the programme. The education provider has made it clear that the new external examiners are qualified and experienced, in line with the assessment regulations for the programme. However, on checking the names of the examiners against the HCPC Register, the visitors noted that none of the appointees are registered. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that if the external examiners are not on the HCPC register, evidence regarding the external examiners qualifications and experience should be provided, or if future appointees are registered with the HCPC, the registration number 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 five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	City University
Programme title	MSc Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitor(s)	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - PGDip/MSc Course Handbook
 - PGDip/MSc Clinical Handbook
 - Division of Language and Communication Science Staff 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 the education provider has appointed new external examiners for the programme. The education provider has made it clear that the new external examiners are qualified and experienced, in line with the assessment regulations for the programme. However, on checking the names of the examiners against the HCPC Register, the visitors noted that none of the appointees are registered. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that if the external examiners are not on the HCPC register, evidence regarding the external examiners qualifications and experience should be provided, or if future appointees are registered with the HCPC, the registration number 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 five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	City University
Programme title	Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitor(s)	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - PGDip/MSc Course Handbook
 - PGDip/MSc Clinical Handbook
 - Division of Language and Communication Science Staff 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 the education provider has appointed new external examiners for the programme. The education provider has made it clear that the new external examiners are qualified and experienced, in line with the assessment regulations for the programme. However, on checking the names of the examiners against the HCPC Register, the visitors noted that none of the appointees are registered. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that if the external examiners are not on the HCPC register, evidence regarding the external examiners qualifications and experience should be provided, or if future appointees are registered with the HCPC, the registration number 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

Name of education provider	East Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust
Name of validating body	Institute of Health Care Development
Programme title	IHCD Paramedic Award
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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
 - Action Log for HEA 038 PHAD (PSC 2001)
 - Recruitment and Selection Policy v.5
 - EMAS Equal Opportunity Policy v2. Public Drive; S:Drive; Library
 - EMAS NHS Trust Learning and Development Strategy 2013-2017
 - Faculty CV2013 Folder

- Research Management and Governance Policy v4.
- Tutors supported the Research Team with *Pain Study (PROMPT)* docs.
- Tutors supported the development of a *Mobile Falls Response Team* docs.
- EMAS Clinical Placements Competency Record Clinical v.9 Book 8
- :Student Joining Instructions v.8
- Grievance Policy v5.
- Paramedic Programme Student Progress Record v.7
- Organisational Learning Prospectus 2013-14
- Individual Practice Review/ Performance Development Review Policy v4 2012
- Clinical Supervision Policy v2.

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

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Orthoptics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Orthoptist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Derek Adrian-Harris (Radiographer) Gail Stephenson (Orthoptist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University & University of Strathclyde
Programme title	D.Psych in Counselling Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Counselling psychologist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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.....	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Goldsmiths College University of London
Programme title	MA Art Psychotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Art therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist) Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Louise Devlin
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
- Letter from HCPC confirming major changes submitted
- Annual monitoring visitors' report, March 2012

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: From a review of the Annual Programme Review 2011-12 provided, the visitors noted that there was an increase in student numbers to 39 in the academic year 2011–12, and to 41 in 2012–13 (page 6), from 31 in 2010–11. The visitors noted that the number of art psychotherapy staff for the programme has increased from 3.4 full time equivalent (FTE) to 3.8 FTE. They also noted that the FTE staff are supported by an unchanged number of six visiting tutors. However, the visitors were unclear of the extent of the visiting tutors' input to the programme, and whether this input has changed following the rise in student numbers. As such, the visitors require further evidence that the increase in the number of FTE staff, with the six visiting tutors is an appropriate to meet the increase in student numbers.

Suggested documentation: Further information regarding the number, and experience, or full time and part time staff in place on the programme, in light of the increase in student numbers over the last two academic years.

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

Reason: From a review of the Annual Programme Review 2011-12 provided, the visitors noted that “the increased student intake from approx. 75 (2010) to approx. 100 (2012) has created the need for more placements and supervision” (page 9). Whilst the visitors noted that the number of new placements has been increased (page 9), they could not determine by how much, and therefore that the number of placements continues to be sufficient to meet the rise in student numbers.

Suggested documentation: The visitors require further evidence of the number of placements available to students on this programme, due to the increase in student numbers, to demonstrate that there continues to be an appropriate number of placements to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Institute of Psychiatry, King's College London
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	14 March 2013

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC Annual Monitoring 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
 - Example of Interview
 - Example offer of training place
 - Photo shot of Programme Front Page on KEATS

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

Name of education provider	Iron Mill Institute
Name of validating	University of Worcester
Programme title	MA in Dramatherapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Dramatherapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Jane Fisher-Norton, (Drama therapist) Gail Brand, (Music therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	18 March 2014

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
 - Letter from Guinness Hermitage to business customers using the X-Centre, Exeter.

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 on reading the documentation provided for the audit noted that it was not clear whether there was an expectation from the training course that regular clinical supervision be provided by the placement provider. The Visitors consider that clinical supervision within the placement setting is important and therefore suggest to the education provider that perhaps the placement coordinator could work towards finding placements where this is possible, if this is not already occurring.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Keele University
Programme title	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Clinical Language Sciences (Speech and Language Therapy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitor(s)	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - Course Approval Template
 - Clinical & Personal Skills 2 Handbook
 - Transition to Professional Practice Module Outline
 - Transition to Professional Practice Viva Assessment

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

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietician
Name and profession of HCPC visitor(s)	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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 that the education provider has mapped the curriculum and learning outcomes of this programme to the revised standards of proficiency (SOPs) for dietitians. While the visitors recognise the work that has been undertaken to map the curriculum and learning outcomes to the new SOPs, they would like the programme team to note that this annual monitoring audit covers the 2011–12 and the 2012–13 academic years and the revised SOPs were published in February 2013. Therefore the visitors have not considered any changes to the programme that have resulted from the implementation of the new SOPs in this annual monitoring audit. Any changes to the programme which are made as a result of the implementation of the revised SOPs will be considered as part of the programme's next annual monitoring audit in the 2015–16 academic year.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist) Liz Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Louise Devlin
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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 Approval Template – Level 4 Exercise For Health
 - Module Approval Template – Level 5 Placement Practice & Theory 2.3
 - Module Approval Template – Level 6 Working In Contemporary Health Settings

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

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme title	MA Art Psychotherapy Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Art therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist) Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Louise Devlin
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - Student course handbook 2013-14

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

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Simon Willoughby-Booth (Arts therapist) Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Louise Devlin
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - Course Approval Template Document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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	Error! Bookmark not defined. 2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist) Liz Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Louise Devlin
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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
 - Major change SETs mapping document (submitted September 2013)

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: Visitor comments

The visitors noted that the education provider submitted separate sets of identical documentation for both the MSc and PgDip programmes. The visitors would therefore like to suggest that for future annual monitoring submissions, if there are not any differences between changes made for the two programmes, the education provider should submit one set of documentation for both programmes, to save duplication of work.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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 did not submit all listed documentation as no students have been recruited on to the programme for the past two years.

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

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme title	Pg Dip Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietician
Name and profession of HCPC visitor(s)	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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 that the education provider has mapped the curriculum and learning outcomes of this programme to the revised standards of proficiency (SOPs) for dietitians. While the visitors recognise the work that has been undertaken to map the curriculum and learning outcomes to the new SOPs, they would like the programme team to note that this annual monitoring audit covers the 2011–12 and the 2012–13 academic years and the revised SOPs were published in February 2013. Therefore the visitors have not considered any changes to the programme that have resulted from the implementation of the new SOPs in this annual monitoring audit. Any changes to the programme which are made as a result of the implementation of the revised SOPs will be considered as part of the programme's next annual monitoring audit in the 2015–16 academic year.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme title	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Simon Willoughby-Booth (Arts therapist) Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Louise Devlin
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - Course Approval Template Document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme title	PG Dip Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist) Liz Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Louise Devlin
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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
 - Major change SETs mapping document (submitted September 2013)

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: Visitor comments

The visitors noted that the education provider submitted separate sets of identical documentation for both the MSc and PgDip programmes. The visitors would therefore like to suggest that for future annual monitoring submissions, if there are not any differences between changes made for the two programmes, the education provider should submit one set of documentation for both programmes, to save duplication of work.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time (in service)
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Derek Adrian-Harris (Diagnostic radiographer) Gail Stephenson (Orthoptist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time Part time (In Service)
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational Therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Margaret Foster (Occupational therapist) Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - Appendix 10 extract from Generic Document C, External Examiners

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 has mapped the curriculum and learning outcomes of this programme to the revised standards of proficiency (SOPs) for occupational therapists. While the visitors recognise the work that has been undertaken to map the curriculum and learning outcomes to the new SOPs, they would like the programme team to note that this annual monitoring audit covers the 2011–12 and the 2012–13 academic years and the revised SOPs were published in March 2013. Therefore the visitors have not considered any changes to the programme that have resulted from the implementation of the new SOPs in this annual monitoring audit. Any changes to the programme which are made as a result of the implementation of the revised SOPs will be considered as part of the programme's next annual monitoring audit in the 2015–16 academic year.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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
 - Updated Appendix 10 - from Generic Document C, External Examiners

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

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Julia Cutforth (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - Faculty of Health & Social Care Resource Document January 2014

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the education provider has mapped the curriculum and learning outcomes of this programme to the revised standards of proficiency (SOPs) for Therapeutic radiography. While the visitors recognise the work that has been undertaken to map the curriculum and learning outcomes to the new SOPs, they would like the programme team to note that this annual monitoring audit covers the 2011–12 and the 2012–13 academic years and the revised SOPs were published in May 2013. Therefore the visitors have not considered any changes to the programme that have resulted from the implementation of the new SOPs in this annual monitoring audit. Any changes to the programme which are made as a result of the implementation of the revised SOPs will be considered as part of the programme's next annual monitoring audit in the 2015–16 academic year.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme title	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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
- Updated Appendix 10 - from Generic Document C, External Examiners

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

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme title	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational Therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Margaret Foster (Occupational therapist) Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - Appendix 10 – Extract from Generic Document C, change in External Examiner

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 has mapped the curriculum and learning outcomes of this programme to the revised standards of proficiency (SOPs) for occupational therapists. While the visitors recognise the work that has been undertaken to map the curriculum and learning outcomes to the new SOPs, they would like the programme team to note that this annual monitoring audit covers the 2011–12 and the 2012–13 academic years and the revised SOPs were published in March 2013. Therefore the visitors have not considered any changes to the programme that have resulted from the implementation of the new SOPs in this annual monitoring audit. Any changes to the programme which are made as a result of the implementation of the revised SOPs will be considered as part of the programme's next annual monitoring audit in the 2015–16 academic year.

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

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme title	Pg Dip Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Julia Cutforth (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - Faculty of Health & Social Care Resource Document January 2014
 - Appendix 7 - FASC paperwork PgDip - Programme Modification Request TRT_7_005 Patient and Resource Management in Radiotherapy

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 has mapped the curriculum and learning outcomes of this programme to the revised standards of proficiency (SOPs) for Therapeutic radiography. The visitors also noted modifications to introduce the module TRT_7_005 Patient and Resource Management in Radiotherapy).

While the visitors recognise the work that has been undertaken to map the curriculum and learning outcomes to the new SOPs, they would like the programme team to note that this annual monitoring audit covers the 2011–12 and the 2012–13 academic years and the revised SOPs were published in May 2013. Therefore the visitors have not considered any changes to the programme that have resulted from the implementation of the new SOPs in this annual monitoring audit. For the same reason, the visitors have not reviewed the modifications to introduce the module (TRT_7_005 Patient and Resource Management in Radiotherapy).

Any changes to the programme which are made as a result of the implementation of the revised SOPs will be considered as part of the programme's next annual monitoring audit in the 2015–16 academic year.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme title	Postgraduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist) David Packwood (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Sandwich)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist) David Packwood (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitor(s)	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Melvyn Myers (Clinical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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
 - Tomorrows Workforce Curriculum 2012 Volume 1
 - Tomorrows Workforce Curriculum 2012 Volume 2
 - PPDF Workbook
 - Practice Assessment
 - Staff CVs

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 the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). However, the visitors wished to note that the comprehensive nature of the submission was not entirely conducive to coming to their decision. The visitors articulated that the education provider should consider the relevance of submitted documentation, as the documentation necessary for an audit submission such as this is usually far less than provided for this audit. The annual monitoring process is a retrospective one focusing on programme's ongoing approval and as such a submission usually only consists of the required documentation as highlighted above. Any additional information is only needed when the programme has undergone changes which affect how the SETs continue to be met. The visitors would therefore like to highlight to the education provider that the volume of documentation, and subsequently work, is not necessary for future HCPC annual monitoring audits for audits where limited changes have been made.

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

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Julia Cutforth (Physiotherapist) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - Tomorrows workforce curriculum document BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy Volume 1
 - Tomorrows workforce curriculum document BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy Volume 2
 - 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 annual monitoring documentation submitted made reference to the Health Professions Council (HPC). The visitors note the documentation may have been created prior to our name change to the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), but suggest the education provider review the current programme documentation to ensure references to the HCPC are accurate.

They also note further references to the HCPC, the standards of proficiency and the standards of conduct, performance and ethics would be useful for students within module descriptors and reading lists where appropriate.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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
 - Tomorrows Workforce Curriculum Document Volume 1
 - Tomorrows Workforce Curriculum Document Volume 2
 - Tomorrows Workforce Practice Assessment Document Handbook
 - Staff CVs

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

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitor(s)	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Melvyn Myers (Clinical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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
 - Tomorrows Workforce Curriculum 2012 Volume 1
 - Tomorrows Workforce Curriculum 2012 Volume 2
 - PPDF Workbook
 - Practice Placement Assessment Form
 - Staff CVs

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 the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). However, the visitors wished to note that the comprehensive nature of the submission was not entirely conducive to coming to their decision. The visitors articulated that the education provider should consider the relevance of submitted documentation, as the documentation necessary for an audit submission such as this is usually far less than provided for this audit. The annual monitoring process is a retrospective one focusing on programme's ongoing approval and as such a submission usually only consists of the required documentation as highlighted above. Any additional information is only needed when the programme has undergone changes which affect how the SETs continue to be met. The visitors would therefore like to highlight to the education provider that the volume of documentation, and subsequently work, is not necessary for future HCPC annual monitoring audits for audits where limited changes have been made.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Julia Cutforth (Physiotherapist) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - Tomorrows workforce curriculum document MSc Physiotherapy Volume 1
 - Tomorrows workforce curriculum document MSc Physiotherapy Volume 2
 - 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

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	Prescribing for Non Medical Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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
 - Staff CV
 - External Examiner CV

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

Name of education provider	Nottingham Trent University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist) David Packwood (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Outreach Rescue and Medic Skills
Programme title	Hazardous Environment Medicine Paramedic Award
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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 has provided external examiner report and response for one year only as the programme has run for one year only since its approval in September 2012.

- ORMS Faculty list

- Example of updated Module Descriptor - Trauma Module
- Meeting notes from Faculty (client) meeting
- Extracts from Compliance Log - evidence to illustrate how our quality monitoring systems take into account the views of service users and students.
- ORMS Quality Manual - evidence to support improvements in Internal Quality as per recommendations from Internal Audit findings.

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: The visitors noted, whilst reading the external examiner report for 2013–14, that the external examiner had pointed out that the portfolio reflected a high level of practice in the military field of paramedic practice, but not civilian paramedic practice. The response to the external examiner report stated that this would be added to the assignment brief to ensure that civilian paramedic practice should be included in the portfolio. The visitors could not find evidence that this change has been made, and were therefore unsure whether this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates this standard continues to be met if the assignment brief has been revised to ensure that the students include civilian and military paramedic practice in the portfolio.

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

Reason: The visitors, on reading the external examiner report for 2013–14, saw that the moderation of marking was variable. The external examiner highlighted differences in the marking. The response said that this would be reviewed and that a system of double marking would be put in place. The visitors could not see how the review would ensure that the variations in marking highlighted by the external examiner would be adequately addressed as no evidence was provided.

Suggested documentation: Documentation to evidence that the review of the programme moderation of marking has been implemented.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust
Name of validating body	University of Oxford
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin Psych)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	14 March 2014

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
 - Clearing House for Postgraduate Courses in Clinical Psychology Entry 2013
 - SHA Performance Review 2011-12
 - SHA Performance Review 2012 -2013

- Review of Professional and Research Activity 2009- 2013.
- Course Handbook 2013
- Course Syllabus x 3 (1 for each year group)

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Derek Adrian-Harris (Diagnostic radiographer) Gail Stephenson (Orthoptist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: From a review of the annual report for the academic year 2011–12, the visitors noted comments about changes to the programme curriculum structure. The visitors noted that the 60 credit modules were split into 20 credit and 40 credit modules. The visitors were not presented with evidence to support the changes to the programme curriculum and therefore require documentation which articulates how the new modules and their learning outcomes will be delivered to ensure students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for diagnostic radiographers. The visitors also require further information if the changes have impacted on the overall curriculum design, content and structure.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding curriculum, assessments and how the learning outcomes for the new modules with 20 and 40 credits will be delivered and assessed, such as the original and updated module descriptors for comparison.

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

Reason: From a review of the annual report for the academic year 2011–12, the visitors noted comments about changes to the programme curriculum structure. The visitors noted that the 60 credit modules were split into 20 credit and 40 credit modules. The visitors were not presented with evidence to support the changes to the programme curriculum and therefore require documentation which articulates how the new modules and their learning outcomes will be assessed to ensure students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for diagnostic radiographers. The visitors also require further information if the changes have impacted on the overall curriculum design, content and structure.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding curriculum, assessments and how the learning outcomes for the new modules with 20 and 40 credits will be delivered and assessed, such as the original and updated module descriptors for comparison.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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
 - Complaints Process Document
 - NES Audit tool for practice placement

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

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitor(s)	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Melvyn Myers (Clinical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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 Joanna Beveridge, Catriona Dillingham and Sarah Kantartzis
 - Application to School Academic Board (SAB) for alteration to level 3 module assessment O3149

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

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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
 - Definitive Programme Document
 - Student handbook
 - Practice placement assessment forms

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Local anaesthetic Prescription only medicine
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist) Margaret Foster (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - BSc Hons Speech and Language Therapy handbook 2012-13

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: From a review of the annual report for the academic year 2011–12, the visitors noted comments about changes to the programme curriculum structure. The visitors noted that the 60 credit modules were split into 20 credit and 40 credit modules. The visitors were not presented with evidence to support the changes to the programme curriculum and therefore require documentation which articulates how the new modules and their learning outcomes will be delivered to ensure students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for diagnostic radiographers. The visitors also require further information if the changes have impacted on the overall curriculum design, content and structure.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding curriculum, assessments and how the learning outcomes for the new modules with 20 and 40 credits will be delivered and assessed.

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

Reason: The visitors noted the following statement in the 2011 – 12 Annual Monitoring Report; “Staffing resources have been an issue for students in the previous NSS. These have been temporarily addressed with the appointment a 0.6 academic post for two years. This post will potentially end in July 2013. We see the continuation of this post essential to the development of radiography at QMU.” They noted that in the 2012 – 13 Annual Monitoring Report the issue of staffing resources is highlighted again, where it states that though additional administrative support would relieve staff and ensure consistency. It states that increasing numbers in Diagnostic and Therapeutic Radiography (undergraduate and postgraduate) have impacted on staff workload, and the staff also deliver post registration modules. The report states that “...the fixed term contract has been made permanent and there is a new member of staff imminent for diagnostic radiography...”, but the visitors were unclear as to whether this was in reference to the 0.6 academic post referred to above, or was a separate matter. This report also states that the workload related to therapeutic radiography is increasing for therapeutic radiography staff, having an overall effect on staff responsibilities and the ability to devote significant time to supporting students. The visitors therefore require further information as to how this standard continues to be met under the increased numbers of students.

Suggested documentation: Up-to-date confirmation of student numbers, and further clarification on the number of administrative, teaching and management staff in place are how they are able to deliver the programme effectively.

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

Reason: From a review of the annual report for the academic year 2011–12, the visitors noted comments about changes to the programme curriculum structure. The visitors noted that the 60 credit modules were split into 20 credit and 40 credit modules. The visitors were not presented with evidence to support the changes to the programme curriculum and therefore require documentation which articulates how the new modules and their learning outcomes will be assessed to ensure students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for diagnostic radiographers. The visitors also require further information if the changes have impacted on the overall curriculum design, content and structure.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding curriculum, assessments and how the learning outcomes for the new modules with 20 and 40 credits will be delivered and assessed.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	BSc Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Local anaesthetic Prescription only medicine
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	Local Anaesthesia for HCPC registered podiatrists (Previously Local Anaesthesia for HPC registered podiatrists)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant entitlements	Local anaesthetic
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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 did not submit all listed documentation as the programme ran for the first time from September 2013.

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

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	MSc (pre registration) in Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist) Margaret Foster (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
- PGDip SLT Speech and Language Therapy programme handbook 2012-13

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

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	MSc Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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
 - Complaints Process Document
 - NES Audit tool for practice placement

Section three: Additional documentation

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

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.

Reason: The visitors noted that the Annual Monitoring Report 2012-13 states that the education provider has reviewed the delivery of module DM032 as follows; “Remove the between placement consolidation requirement of the module to allow greater access to placement start dates for students on the programme. This will enable all students to access placements at their normal cohort time.” The visitors were unable to find further information to ensure that the removal of this consolidation aspect of the module does not impact on reflective learning opportunities of the programme. They also require further information on the ability of students to start “at their normal cohort time” and the integration of theory and practice.

Suggested documentation: Further detail of the changes to module DM032, and the rationale for these changes.

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 documentation submitted contained several references to the HPC, the HCPC's former name. The visitors advise the education provider to review all programme documentation going forward to ensure it is reflective of the current setting of regulation for dietitians.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitor(s)	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Melvyn Myers (Clinical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the external examiner reports for both 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 that staffing issues were raised as a concern. The external examiner commented “This programme is validated to run with a certain staffing level which is not being met at the moment. Visiting Lecturer funds have also been cut this year for the programme. In addition, the validation occurred with lower student numbers – and this year has seen a large increase in cohort numbers, with increasing numbers staying on to the Master’s level (rather than exiting with a PGDip). The effect on staff workloads is evident. Student feedback has indicated that they are aware of staff heavy workloads and time pressures, which (it is perceived) has resulted in a lack of opportunity for 1:1 student supervision and reduced formative feedback opportunities.” The visitors therefore require additional documentation to demonstrate that the programme continues to maintain an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Documentation to demonstrate that the programme has sufficient staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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
 - Definitive Programme Document
 - Student handbook
 - Practice placement assessment forms
 - Information for Prospective Applicants

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 new Information for Prospective Applicants document submitted as part of the audit contained references to the HPC, the HCPC's former name. There was also a reference to the HPC in the website's introductory information for potential applicants. The visitors advise the education provider to review all information provided to applicants and students to ensure it is reflective of the current setting of regulation for physiotherapists.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	Pg Dip Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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
 - Complaints Process Document
 - NES Audit tool for practice placement

Section three: Additional documentation

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

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.

Reason: The visitors noted that the Annual Monitoring Report 2012-13 states that the education provider has reviewed the delivery of module DM032 as follows; “Remove the between placement consolidation requirement of the module to allow greater access to placement start dates for students on the programme. This will enable all students to access placements at their normal cohort time.” The visitors were unable to find further information to ensure that the removal of this consolidation aspect of the module does not impact on reflective learning opportunities of the programme. They also require further information on the ability of students to start “at their normal cohort time” and the integration of theory and practice.

Suggested documentation: Further detail of the changes to module DM032, and the rationale for these changes.

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 documentation submitted contained several references to the HPC, the HCPC's former name. The visitors advise the education provider to review all programme documentation going forward to ensure it is reflective of the current setting of regulation for dietitians.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitor(s)	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Melvyn Myers (Clinical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the external examiner reports for both 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 that staffing issues were raised as a concern. The external examiner commented “This programme is validated to run with a certain staffing level which is not being met at the moment. Visiting Lecturer funds have also been cut this year for the programme. In addition, the validation occurred with lower student numbers – and this year has seen a large increase in cohort numbers, with increasing numbers staying on to the Master’s level (rather than exiting with a PGDip). The effect on staff workloads is evident. Student feedback has indicated that they are aware of staff heavy workloads and time pressures, which (it is perceived) has resulted in a lack of opportunity for 1:1 student supervision and reduced formative feedback opportunities.” The visitors therefore require additional documentation to demonstrate that the programme continues to maintain an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Documentation to demonstrate that the programme has sufficient staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma + MSc (pre-registration) in Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist) Margaret Foster (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - PGDip SLT Speech and Language Therapy programme handbook 2012-13

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

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme title	Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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
 - Definitive Programme Document
 - Student handbook
 - Practice placement assessment forms
 - Information for Prospective Applicants

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 some inconsistencies in the documentation, in that some references within the reports only referred to the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) programme, where it was evident that they related to the Post Graduate Diploma Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) also. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team ensure that both programmes are specified to ensure clarity in the documentation. The visitors noted that the new Information for Prospective Applicants document submitted as part of the audit contained references to the HPC, the HCPC's former name. There was also a reference to the HPC in the website's introductory information for potential applicants. The visitors advise the education provider to review all information provided to applicants and students to ensure it is reflective of the current setting of regulation for physiotherapists.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	Pg Dip Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted the following statement in the 2011 – 12 Annual Monitoring Report; “Staffing resources have been an issue for students in the previous NSS. These have been temporarily addressed with the appointment a 0.6 academic post for two years. This post will potentially end in July 2013. We see the continuation of this post essential to the development of radiography at QMU.” They noted that in the 2012 – 13 Annual Monitoring Report the issue of staffing resources is highlighted again, where it states that though additional administrative support would relieve staff and ensure consistency. It states that increasing numbers in Diagnostic and Therapeutic Radiography (undergraduate and postgraduate) have impacted on staff workload, and the staff also deliver post registration modules. The report states that “...the fixed term contract has been made permanent and there is a new member of staff imminent for diagnostic radiography...”, but the visitors were unclear as to whether this was in reference to the 0.6 academic post referred to above, or was a separate matter. This report also states that the workload related to therapeutic radiography is increasing for therapeutic radiography staff, having an overall effect on staff responsibilities and the ability to devote significant time to supporting students. The visitors therefore require further information as to how this standard continues to be met under the increased numbers of students.

Suggested documentation: Up-to-date confirmation of student numbers, and further clarification on the number of administrative, teaching and management staff in place are how they are able to deliver the programme effectively.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Roehampton University
Programme title	MA Dramatherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Drama therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist) Dianne Gammage (Drama therapist) Shaaron Pratt (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	27 February 2014

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
 - Staffing establishment document
 - Room bookings 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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the external examiner for the programme in 2011 – 2012 was recruited to the staff team commencing in the year 2012 – 2013. Depending on the recruitment timescale, this may have led to an overlap of the external examiner's signing off their report in September 2012 and their recruitment and consequent employment on the programme. The visitors therefore were unclear how the regular monitoring and evaluation systems were applied throughout this process, and require further information to demonstrate how they maintained the robustness of the external monitoring processes for the programme throughout this period.

Suggested documentation: Further information as to how the education provider ensures effective, regular, external monitoring of the programme and how this was maintained during the period between the 2011 - 2012 academic year and the 2012 – 2013 academic year.

3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the internal monitoring reports for the past two years as part of the submission. The visitors noted that, as well as the recent increase of student intake in introducing full time cohorts, the programme team have also identified opportunities to increase the number of international students on the programme. However, the visitors could not find detail regarding proposed numbers for this, or any additional resources that would be available to provide the necessary support for the needs of full time international students. Availability of physical resources was highlighted as a significant issue throughout the documentation, and though the submission contained further information on room bookings, it was difficult for the visitors to determine, from this document, the sufficiency of the physical spaces provided for any additional international students on the programme. The external examiner's report 2012 – 13 states that a dedicated space for the full time programme has been identified, though the visitors could not find detail of the designated use of this space or how an additional increase in full time, international, students may impact on these resources. The visitors were not provided with any detail of monitoring processes that the programme has in place to ensure that the physical resources to support the programme are sufficient. Therefore they were unable to see how this programme continues to monitor the effectiveness of resources available to support students on the programme.

Suggested documentation: The visitors require further evidence to ensure that the resources offered to support students on the programme remains sufficient with the additional demands of additional international students.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the internal monitoring report 2012 – 2013 (page 1) states that identifying sufficient placements for the programme remains a challenge. This was highlighted throughout the documentation submitted and the visitors noted that, though students appeared to be being placed into suitable placements, this was largely down to additional work to support students in this process from programme staff. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how this will continue with the increased numbers of students. The programme team recognise in the internal monitoring report that additional support is required for the Departmental placement officer, though it is not clear whether resources for this have been found.

Suggested documentation: The visitors require evidence that students on both the full time and part time routes will continue to be supported and provided with sufficient placements under the increased student intake.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Roehampton University
Programme title	MA Music Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Music therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Pauline Etkin (Music therapist) Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	27 February 2014

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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided for this annual monitoring submission that the external examiner report (2012 - 2013) highlights that there may be concerns around the number of staff available to deliver the programme noting in particular that the ‘...team have managed several staffing changes during this period’. The visitors also noted the education provider’s response to the external examiner report, however they could not determine from this how the education provider had responded to these comments in particular. The visitors could not, therefore, find evidence that the programme team had taken action in response to these comments and re-assured the external examiner that the levels of staffing was sufficient to deliver the programme effectively . As such the visitors require further evidence to this standard.

Suggested documentation: The visitors suggest information relating to the external examiners comments and how the programme team has responded to these comments could be provided.

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

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitor(s)	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Melvyn Myers (Clinical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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
 - Updated SoPs mapping document
 - Practice placement forms used since 2009 approval to September 2013 and practice placement forms used since September 2013.

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 has mapped the curriculum and learning outcomes of this programme to the revised standards of proficiency (SOPs) for occupational therapists. While the visitors recognise the work that has been undertaken to map the curriculum and learning outcomes to the revised SOPs, they would like the programme team to note that this annual monitoring audit covers the 2011–12 and the 2012–13 academic years and the revised SOPs were published in February 2013. Therefore the visitors have not considered any changes to the programme that have resulted from the implementation of the revised SOPs in this annual monitoring audit. Any changes to the programme which are made as a result of the implementation of the revised SOPs will be considered as part of the programme's next annual monitoring audit in the 2015–16 academic year.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) Laura Golding (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of postal review	1 April 2014

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
 - Equipment List
 - Psychometric Test Inventory
 - Subject Leaders Annual Reports 2011
 - Subject Leaders Annual Reports 2012

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme title	Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DCounsPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Counselling psychologist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitor(s)	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Melvyn Myers (Clinical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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
 - Updated SoPs mapping document
 - Practice placement forms used since 2009 approval to September 2013 and practice placement forms used since September 2013.

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 has mapped the curriculum and learning outcomes of this programme to the revised standards of proficiency (SOPs) for occupational therapists. While the visitors recognise the work that has been undertaken to map the curriculum and learning outcomes to the revised SOPs, they would like the programme team to note that this annual monitoring audit covers the 2011–12 and the 2012–13 academic years and the revised SOPs were published in February 2013. Therefore the visitors have not considered any changes to the programme that have resulted from the implementation of the revised SOPs in this annual monitoring audit. Any changes to the programme which are made as a result of the implementation of the revised SOPs will be considered as part of the programme's next annual monitoring audit in the 2015–16 academic year.

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

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme title	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitor(s)	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Melvyn Myers (Clinical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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
 - Updated SoPs mapping document
 - Practice placement forms used since 2009 approval to September 2013 and practice placement forms used since September 2013.

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 has mapped the curriculum and learning outcomes of this programme to the revised standards of proficiency (SOPs) for occupational therapists. While the visitors recognise the work that has been undertaken to map the curriculum and learning outcomes to the revised SOPs, they would like the programme team to note that this annual monitoring audit covers the 2011–12 and the 2012–13 academic years and the revised SOPs were published in February 2013. Therefore the visitors have not considered any changes to the programme that have resulted from the implementation of the revised SOPs in this annual monitoring audit. Any changes to the programme which are made as a result of the implementation of the revised SOPs will be considered as part of the programme's next annual monitoring audit in the 2015–16 academic year.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	The University of Northampton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Simon Willoughby-Booth (Arts therapist) Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Louise Devlin
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Additional online programme information
 - Programme specification document
 - Module specifications

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.

2.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Reason: From a review of the annual monitoring audit form provided, the visitors noted the required number of UCAS points for entry to the programme has been increased from a minimum of 260, to a minimum of 280. In the SETs mapping, the education provider identified previous entry requirements for Scottish and Irish applicants. However, they did not indicate whether there were any changes to these requirements. Therefore, the visitors were unclear if the requirements for Scottish and Irish applicants had changed. Additionally, the entry requirements for Scottish and Irish applicants were not included on the weblink provided as evidence for SET 2.1.

Suggested documentation: The visitors require further information to demonstrate if the entry requirements for Scottish and Irish applicants have changed, and if they have changed, how potential applicants are informed of the entry requirements to ensure that they are able to make an informed choice regarding whether to apply to the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

From a review of the information provided, the visitors noted that much of the documentation referred to BSc Occupational Therapy, rather than the approved title of BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy. The visitors therefore suggest that the programme documentation is updated to reflect the approved title. The visitors also noted reference to the HCPC's former name, the Health Professions Council (HPC) on the weblink that was provided in the annual monitoring audit form (SET 2.1). The visitors therefore suggest that the programme team review all documentation to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	The University of Northampton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Local anaesthetic Prescription only medicine
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - Students complaints policy
 - CV for newly appointed senior lecturer
 - Board of Studies Minutes
 - Professional misconduct policy
 - Educational review meetings

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

Name of education provider	The University of Northampton
Programme title	FDS Sc Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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.

2.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Reason: The mapping document provided stated that no changes had been made to programme admission. However, the visitors noted in the Undergraduate Programme Review 2011-2012, the education provider has highlighted a change to the admissions policy. The change states “Admission policy changed to have C1 provisional and practical exam booked by start of course for 2013 entry”. The visitors were not presented with evidence to support the changes to the admission policy, therefore it was unclear to the visitors whether the requirements for admission for this programme has changed. The visitors require the education provider to clarify any changes made to the admission procedure for this programme.

Suggested documentation: Updated admissions policy.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors would like to remind the education provider that future changes of this nature should be submitted via 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 one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Simon Willoughby-Booth (Arts therapist) Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Louise Devlin
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - Approval Document 2013
 - Programme Handbook
 - Practice Placement Handbook
 - Programme Specification Document
 - CV's for new members of staff

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 there were a number of changes to the programme curriculum in the last two academic years, and that the education provider informed the HCPC of these changes in October 2012 through the major change process. From the mapping document provided, it was not clear if any additional changes had been made, other than those that have already been approved by the HCPC through the major change process. Therefore, the visitors would like to remind the education provider that, if there are any additional changes to the programme outside of those considered by the major change submitted in October 2012, they should submit another major change notification form.

The visitors would also like to remind the education provider that the HCPC do not set requirements regarding placement hours. Therefore, any references in the documents stating otherwise should be revised. An example of this is in the practice placement handbook (page 44) which states an "HCPC requirement for placement hours".

The visitors would also like to remind the education provider that mapping documents for future annual monitoring audit submissions should only be used to inform the HCPC of changes to the programme within the last two years, that they have not previously informed the HCPC about. Therefore, any changes

considered and agreed through the major change process should not be included. If there have not been any changes to the way in which a standard is met, this should be indicated by writing “Not applicable, no changes made in this area”.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Operating Departments Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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 did not submit all listed documentation as no students have been recruited on to the programme for the past two years.

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

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practitioner
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practitioner (Community Emergency Health)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Chiroprapist / podiatrist) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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 the Annual Review Minutes of 11 October 2012 include a section analysing external examiners' reports, referring to Marilyn Andrews, Angela Glynn and Keith Stevenson. The visitors received reports and responses for two external examiners from each of the past two academic years, but were not able to locate any report from Keith Stevenson, or information as to his role as external examiner.

Suggested documentation: Further information on the role of Keith Stevenson in relation to the programme, and if appropriate, his external examiner report.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Local anaesthetic Prescription only medicine
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme title	Dip HE Operating Departments Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	27 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme title	Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Studies (Community Emergency Health)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Chiroprapist / podiatrist) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme title	Graduate Diploma Paramedic Practitioner (Community Emergency Health)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Chiroprapist / podiatrist) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme title	Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	University of Stirling
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	University of Strathclyde
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Pathology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitor(s)	Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist) Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date postal review	23 April 2014

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
 - Foundations for Practice In Health And Social Care Module Descriptors (M1I513249 Interprofessional Module -Glasgow Caledonian Univ.)
 - Complaints Handling Procedure : University Of Strathclyde

- SLP Entry Decision Tables
- Service User Consent form (Induction)
- Year 1 Handbook
- University of Strathclyde Personal circumstances and Academic Appeals procedure

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

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Derek Adrian-Harris (Diagnostic radiographer) Gail Stephenson (Orthoptist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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
 - Staff Student Liaison Committee and Subject Committee meeting minutes
 - Admissions documentation
 - Staff information, including curriculum vitae
 - Student complaints procedure
 - Attendance monitoring information
 - Fitness to Practice policy

- Moderation guidelines
- Placement reports

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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 October 2012 and March 2013 Subject Committee Meeting minutes states that the assessment of placements in undergraduate degrees will change to a grading system. The visitors were unable to find further information on this change in the November 2013 minutes or the rest of the documentation submitted. If the change is to be implemented in 2013-14 academic year, the visitors accept that this would not fall under the years monitored by this annual monitoring submission. However, the visitors remind the education provider to ensure the HCPC is notified of any major changes to the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Simon Willoughby-Booth (Arts therapist) Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Louise Devlin
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist) Liz Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Louise Devlin
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Local anaesthetic Prescription only medicine
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Derek Adrian-Harris (Diagnostic radiographer) Gail Stephenson (Orthoptist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Therapeutic)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Burgess (Therapeutic radiographer) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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 in the 'Areas for annual consideration by course/subject committees' document provided for this programme that there has been an increase in the commissioned numbers from twelve to sixteen for the third intake of students, in 2014. It also refers to reshaping of clinical modules to accommodate this change. Though they state that there has been expansion in Cancer Services and the development of a second centre in the North West Ireland, the visitors could find no further information provided as to changes to placement provision, any planned enhancement of the teaching facilities or increases in staffing resources to provide the required support for student learning and teaching activities on the programme. The visitors therefore remind the programme team to ensure that they notify the HCPC of any changes to the programme, such as an increase in the student intake or change to placement provision, via 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 one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitor(s)	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	MSc Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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
 - Staff Student Liaison Committee and Subject Committee meeting minutes
 - Admissions documentation
 - Staff information, including curriculum vitae
 - Student complaints procedure
 - Attendance monitoring information
 - Fitness to Practice policy
 - Moderation guidelines

- Placement reports

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	Pg Dip Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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
 - Staff Student Liaison Committee and Subject Committee meeting minutes
 - Admissions documentation
 - Staff information, including curriculum vitae
 - Student complaints procedure
 - Attendance monitoring information
 - Fitness to Practice policy
 - Moderation guidelines

- Placement reports

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Wales, Newport
Name of awarding / validating body	University of Wales
Programme title	MA Music Therapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Music therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Pauline Etkin (Music therapist) Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	27 February 2014

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
 - Procedures for Annual Monitoring
 - Student Complaints Regulations
 - Policy and Procedure Governing Fitness to Practice
 - Module Specifications Handbook

- MA ART Psychotherapy / MA MUSIC Therapy Student Handbook for Years 1, 2 and 3
- MA ART Psychotherapy Research and Dissertation Module Handbook
- MA ART Psychotherapy / MA MUSIC Therapy Clinical 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.

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided for this annual monitoring submission the external examiner report (2012 - 2013) expresses some concerns around the communication of the mitigating circumstances procedures. The visitors have noted that a response to this report was not provided, so are unable to determine how the programme team have responded to this concern. The visitors were also unable to find where the documentation provided to students clearly specifies requirements for the procedures around mitigating circumstances which may affect a student's progression and achievement through the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further information on the programme teams' response to the external examiner's comments and how this response has been acted upon.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	York St John University
Programme title	BHSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time (In Service)
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational Therapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Margaret Foster (Occupational therapist) Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	25 March 2014

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
 - Minutes from NHS Yorkshire and Humber and York St John University Contract Review Meeting
 - Staff curriculum vitae of Jane Cronin-Davis, Helen Jennings and Sue Mesa

- BHSC (Hons) Occupational Therapy validated programme document 2013 validation
- Health Education Yorkshire and Humber Practice Placement Quality Assurance (PPQA)
- Guidance for Educational Leads

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

Name of education provider	York St John University
Programme title	BHSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist) Liz Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Louise Devlin
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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
 - Minutes from NHS Yorkshire and Humber and York St John University Contract Review meeting from Friday 8 March 2013
 - Health Education Yorkshire and Humber Practice Placement Quality Assurance (PPQA): Guidance for Educational Leads
 - Validation document 2013
 - Curriculum vitae - Dr Charikleia Sinai

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

Name of education provider	York St John University
Programme title	BHSc (Hons) Physiotherapy in Service
Mode of delivery	Part time (In Service)
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist) Liz Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Louise Devlin
Date of assessment day	28 March 2014

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
 - Minutes from NHS Yorkshire and Humber Contract Review meeting
 - Health Education Yorkshire and Humber Practice Placement Quality Assurance (PPQA): Guidance for Educational Leads
 - BHSc (Hons) Physiotherapy Programme Document 2013 Validation
 - Curriculum vitae - Dr Charikleia Sinai

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.