

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Centre for Psychotherapy (Belfast Health & Social Care Trust)
<b>Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)</b>	University of East London
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Art Psychotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Arts therapist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Art therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist) Sarah Johnson (Occupational therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Nicola Baker
<b>Date of assessment day / postal review</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Curriculum vitae for new clinical supervisor

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

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

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

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation provided, the visitors noted that there was an indication of uncertainty around the continuation of the course. The letter to the external examiner dated 28 January 2011 stated that the programme team are "are unsure about the future of the MSc Art Psychotherapy programme". The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether this SET continues to be met for students on the programme.

**Suggested documentation:** The education provider must provide further documentation to clarify the security of the programme. This could include business plans or documentation from senior management at the education provider.

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

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the documentation submitted for annual monitoring. They noted that the 2011 – 12 internal monitoring report (page 4) states that the contract between the education provider and the programme lead's employer has terminated, and that a new contract is in the process of being arranged. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether there is currently a programme lead securely in place.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors require confirmation that there is a programme lead currently in place. This could include evidence that the contract has now been recommenced with the programme lead's employer, or evidence that the staffing strategy will ensure that this SET continues to be met.

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

**Reason:** The visitors also noted from the 2011 – 12 internal monitoring report (p4), that there have been significant changes to staffing, both at senior management and at administrative levels. This may affect the way in which the

programme meets SET 3.2. The visitors therefore require further evidence that there are an adequate number of experienced staff in place to effectively deliver the programme.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors require further information indicating the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff that are currently in place.

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bradford
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Sarah Johnson (Occupational therapist) Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Nicola Baker
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Admissions screening tool information document
  - International student monitoring information 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.

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

**Reason:** The education provider highlighted changes to the resources available to students on the programme. From the documentation provided, the visitors noted low response rates and low overall student satisfaction from student feedback mechanisms, as well as a high dropout rate, that could relate back to the changes in resources. The visitors therefore did not see sufficient evidence that the resources to support student learning are being effectively used.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider included the internal monitoring report for one year ago in the annual monitoring submission, but did not provide the internal monitoring report for two years ago. They should therefore provide the visitors with the appropriate documents to evidence actions taken to ensure that resources are being effectively used by students. This may be covered by further internal monitoring documents but could also include the student handbook, information on resources and induction sessions or education provider-wide web information.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

The visitors noted from the documentation that the academic entry requirements have changed from 280 UCAS points to 320, though this was not highlighted in the SETs mapping document submitted for annual monitoring. They also noticed that there are planned changes to the curriculum and to placements. The education provider is reminded that changes to the programme must be reported to the HCPC, through the appropriate monitoring process of annual monitoring or major change.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Brighton
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Sandwich
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

**Reason:** In the course quality document for 2011 – 2012 the visitors noted that there had been no recruitment to the programme as the programme was closing. There had been no indication prior to the annual monitoring submission that the programme could close. As there is a requirement under the HCPC Standards of education and training for the education provider to demonstrate that the programme has a secure place within the education provider's business plan, the visitors were concerned that the programme appeared to be at risk. The visitors also noted that there were several areas of concern raised by students in terms of teaching and assessment in the 2010 – 2011 course quality report. Therefore the visitors want to receive additional documentation to clearly demonstrate that the programme is not at risk and that the issues raised in terms of teaching and learning have been addressed.

**Suggested Documentation:** Evidence to demonstrate that the programme remains secure within the education provider's business plan and that the issues raised by the students have been resolved.

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

**Reason:** The visitors in reading the external examiners report for 2011 – 2012 noted that there was a whole examination failure for the year. It would seem that this is a recurrent issue as there had been similar comment in the course quality document for the 2010 – 2011. The visitors were therefore concerned that the issue had not been addressed and require further documentation to show how the education provider is now attempting to address this issue to ensure that there are appropriate standards of assessment in place.

**Suggested documentation:** Documentation to demonstrate how the education provider is addressing the issues regarding the assessment standards for 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**

The visitors want to inform the education provider that if the programme is closing, as it was suggested in the course monitoring report, there is a process for closing a programme. Information regarding the closure of the programme can be obtained from the Education department at 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 .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Cumbria
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Prescribing (Masters Level)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlements</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Programme Quality Committee meeting minutes (28.11.12)
  - Programme Quality Committee meeting minutes (03.05.12)
  - Student evaluation using Bristol online survey – Semester 2, 2011-12
  - Student evaluation using Bristol online survey – Semester 2, 2010-11

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

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

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation submitted that the education provider has listed no changes in the SETs mapping document. However in the minutes of the 'meeting of the Community and Public Health programme Quality Committee' on 28 November 2012, the action under item 12.04 states that "from September 2012 onwards the curriculum will be changed accordingly in line with the current controlled drug prescribing legislation", and the subsequent action that the curriculum has been changed accordingly. The visitors could not find any evidence of these changes within the documentation submitted.

**Suggested documentation:** Documentation indicating changes to the curriculum as indicated in the above mentioned document and the impact upon the learning outcomes to ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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

**Reason:** In the minutes of the 'meeting of the Community and Public Health programme Quality Committee' on 28 November 2012, the action under item 12.04 states that "from September 2012 onwards the curriculum will be changed accordingly in line with the current controlled drug prescribing legislation". As the visitors did not see information of what these changes to the curriculum are, they were unable to determine that the curriculum continues to remain relevant to current practice.

**Suggested documentation:** Documentation indicating changes to the curriculum as indicated in the above mentioned document, demonstrating that the curriculum remains relevant to current practice following 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Cumbria
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Prescribing (Undergraduate Level)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlements</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Programme Quality Committee meeting minutes (28.11.12)
  - Programme Quality Committee meeting minutes (03.05.12)
  - Student evaluation using Bristol online survey – Semester 2, 2011-12
  - Student evaluation using Bristol online survey – Semester 2, 2010-11

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation submitted that the education provider has listed no changes in the SETs mapping document. However in the minutes of the 'meeting of the Community and Public Health programme Quality Committee' on 28 November 2012, the action under item 12.04 states that "from September 2012 onwards the curriculum will be changed accordingly in line with the current controlled drug prescribing legislation", and the subsequent action that the curriculum has been changed accordingly. The visitors could not find any evidence of these changes within the documentation submitted.

**Suggested documentation:** Documentation indicating changes to the curriculum as indicated in the above mentioned document and the impact upon the learning outcomes to ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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

**Reason:** In the minutes of the 'meeting of the Community and Public Health programme Quality Committee' on 28 November 2012, the action under item 12.04 states that "from September 2012 onwards the curriculum will be changed accordingly in line with the current controlled drug prescribing legislation". As the visitors did not see information of what these changes to the curriculum were, they were unable to determine that the curriculum continues to remain relevant to current practice.

**Suggested documentation:** Documentation indicating changes to the curriculum as indicated in the above mentioned document, demonstrating that the curriculum remains relevant to current practice following 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.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Nottingham
<b>Programme title</b>	Masters of Nutrition (Mnutr)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Full time accelerated
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Dietitian
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Alison Nicholls (Dietitian)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>postal review</b>	17 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - ECQ report 4 years 2010-11
  - Module documents for Introduction to Dietetics
  - Module documents for Food Composition in Dietetics



- Module documents for Diet Therapy
- Module documents for Professionalism and Core Skills

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme title</b>	Health Psychology Research and Professional Practice (MPhil)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Health psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Kathryn Thirlaway (Health psychologist) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - The British Psychology Society (BPS) mapping doc

- The British Psychology Society (BPS) Self-evaluation form

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

**Reason:** At the approval visit in February 2011, the education provider provided evidence to show that programme directors will prepare a 'Programme Annual report' as part of the mechanisms in place to monitor the programme effectively. However, from a review of the programme documentation submitted for annual monitoring, the visitors noted that the education provider did not submit internal quality reports for the last two years. The visitors therefore could not determine from the evidence provided, that this programme continues to have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors require further information regarding the mechanisms that are in place to monitor the programme effectively. The education provider may consider providing internal quality reports as part of the evidence.

#### 4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that the education provider has indicated a change in the teaching approaches used to deliver the programme. The education provider no longer offers workshop on the topics that are covered by the education provider services. The visitors could not determine from the evidence provided, teaching approaches used are appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum as some workshops are no longer delivered and how it is communicated to students. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to ensure that the education provider continues to have appropriate and effective teaching approaches to deliver the programme effectively.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors require further information regarding services provided by the education provider which replaces workshops as mentioned by the education provider and how it is communicated to students.

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme title</b>	Health Psychology Research and Professional Practice (PhD)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Health psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Kathryn Thirlaway (Health psychologist) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	9 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - The British Psychology Society (BPS) mapping doc
  - The British Psychology Society (BPS) Self-evaluation form

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

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

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

**Reason:** At the approval visit in February 2011, the education provider provided evidence to show that programme directors will prepare a 'Programme Annual report' as part of the mechanisms in place to monitor the programme effectively. However, from a review of the programme documentation submitted for annual monitoring, the visitors noted that the education provider did not submit internal quality reports for the last two years. The visitors therefore could not determine from the evidence provided, that this programme continues to have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors require further information regarding the mechanisms that are in place to monitor the programme effectively. The education provider may consider providing internal quality reports as part of the evidence.

#### **4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.**

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that the education provider has indicated a change in the teaching approaches used to deliver the programme. In the SETs mapping document, the education provider has indicated that they no longer offer workshops on the topics that are covered by the education provider services. The visitors could therefore not determine from the evidence provided that the teaching approaches used continue to be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum, as some workshops are no longer delivered. Additionally, the visitors could not see from the documentation how this has been communicated to students.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitors require further information regarding services provided by the education provider which replaces workshops as mentioned by the education provider and how it is communicated to students.

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of the West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme title</b>	Prescribing Principles (Level 3)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - External examiner report for 2009 – 10
  - Module review for 2009 – 10



### 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:** In the absence of the external examiner report (2011 – 12), the responses to the external examiner report for the last two years, and the internal quality report from 2010 – 11, the visitors could not be assured that the programme continues to have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place, and therefore that this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested documentation:** The education provider could provide the documents that were missing from this submission as indicated under 'Section two: Submission details' or an explanation as to why these documents are not available.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of the West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme title</b>	Prescribing Principles (M Level)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - External examiner report for 2009 – 10
  - Module review for 2009 – 10

### 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:** In the absence of the external examiner report (2011 – 12), the responses to the external examiner report for the last two years, and the internal quality report from 2010 – 11, the visitors could not be assured that the programme continues to have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place, and therefore that this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested documentation:** The education provider could provide the documents that were missing from this submission as indicated under 'Section two: Submission details' or an explanation as to why these documents are not available.

### 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.