

## 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	Birmingham City University
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education in Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jenny Ford (Speech and language therapist) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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 visitor .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Birmingham City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	27 May 2015

### 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 visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor 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 visitor**

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitor 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 visitor 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	Birmingham City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Antony Ward (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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 report for Programme Director
  - Letters of confirmation for ongoing approval

### **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	Birmingham City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jenny Ford (Speech and language therapist) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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 Birmingham
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pamela Bagley (Physiotherapist) Anthony Hoswell (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	27 May 2015

### 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 7 postgraduate open day presentation
  - Appendix 8 clinical partners conference day programme
  - Appendix 9a presentation from clinical partners day
  - Appendix 9b clinical partners' clinical feedback
  - Appendix 10a service user focus group meeting plan
  - Appendix 10b summary of themes from service user consultation

### **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**

Following the external examiner's comment in their report for academic year 2013–14, the programme team has indicated to have made changes to the curriculum for September 2015 intake. These changes made to the curriculum falls outside the remit of this annual monitoring period of academic year 2012–13 and 2013–14. However, the visitors would like to remind the education provider that they must inform HCPC through the major change process following the changes made to the curriculum of this 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 visitor .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church 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 role of HCPC visitor	Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	27 May 2015

### 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 visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor 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 visitor**

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitor 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 Chester
Programme title	MA Art Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Art therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Julie Allan (Art therapist) Jane Fisher-Norton (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of postal review	4 June 2015

### 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 Cumbria
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Alison Nicholls (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	27 May 2015

### 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 Cumbria
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Alison Nicholls (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	27 May 2015

### 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
  - Minor change form
  - 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 visitor .....	2
Section five: Visitors' comments .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	27 May 2015

### 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
  - Minor change approval document
  - Module descriptors for new modules
  - Updated standard of proficiency (SOPs) mapping document
  - Fitness to Practise Policy
  - Summary of changes to Academic Regulations
  - Programme specification

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

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor 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 visitor**

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitor 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 visitor 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 annual monitoring documentation, the visitor noted that a number of changes have been made to this approved programme. In addition, the visitor noted that these changes have gone through the education providers own internal minor change process but have not been notified to the HCPC via the major change process. The visitor would therefore like to remind the education provider that they must notify the HCPC of any changes made to an approved programme that affects the standards of education and training 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 Cumbria
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pamela Bagley (Physiotherapist) Anthony Hoswell (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	27 May 2015

### 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 Exeter
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Fiona McCullough (Dietitian) Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of postal review	24 May 2015

### 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
- Annual Programme monitoring submission 2011 - 2012 and 2013 - 2014
  - Annual Student Experience Review and response
  - Key Performance Indicators and Returns
  - Internal curriculum review
  - Annual Contract Performance Management Meeting - Agenda
  - Annual Contract Performance Management submission 2013

- Annual Contract Performance Management submission 2014
- Letter confirming renewal of DClinPsy contract for further 5 years.
- Additional Audit from Goals Form - completed six monthly
- Managing concerns about quality of care on 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 visitor .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Exeter
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Medical Imaging (Diagnostic Radiography)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	27 May 2015

### 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
  - New Staff Curriculum Vitae's
  - Continue Professional Development Statement
  - Statement on move to St Luke's campus
  - Changes to Intended Learning Outcomes
  - Changes to syllabus plan
  - Practice Quality Development Division (PQDD) annual audits
  - Modified assessment arrangements
  - External Examiner Curriculum Vitae

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

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor 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 visitor**

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 visitor 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 visitor .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
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 role of HCPC visitor	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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 visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor 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 visitor**

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitor 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 visitor 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 visitor .....	3
Section five: Visitor comments.....	3

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Lincoln
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 role of HCPC visitor	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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 visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor 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 visitor noted reoccurring comments about student progression in the external examiner reports, for which any possible resulting actions have not been evidenced in this submission. For example, in Emma Munks' external examiner report for 2012–13, there is a statement urging the programme team to “review the events and scheduling which lead to the main board” (page 2). There is a follow up to this in the response section of the report stating that the programme team is “considering” changing assessments to “avoid potential difficulties with processing marks” (page 5). In the same external examiner's report from 2013–14, there is a statement that a change to the thesis / viva process is “being implemented currently” (page 4), but then there is nothing specific in the Annual Report for the programme from 2013–14 about how this is progressing. In the Annual Programme Monitoring Report and Action Plan for 2012–13 there is the statement that the “Issue with [postgraduate research] regulations is being handled by the registries at the two universities now”, but there is no particular follow up to this statement in the report for 2013–14. Therefore, specifically to this issue, but also more broadly, the visitor is unsure how comments made by the external examiners are taken into account when monitoring and evaluating the programme.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitor would like to see how the programme team has addressed the comments of the external examiners about the change in research structure and the impact on student progression and achievement. Documentation could include evidence of any actions relating to changes in research structure.

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

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitor 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 visitor 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 visitor noted that the education provider has mapped to demonstrate how the programme meets SET 3.17 (service users and carers must be involved in the programme). We only required programmes to meet this standard from September 2014 and the period considered in this audit is the academic years 2012–13 and 2013–14. Therefore, the education provider should submit information about how they meet SET 3.17 in their next annual monitoring audit.

In the Annual Programme Monitoring Report and Action Plan for 2012–13 and 2013–14 there are statements about the programme being commissioned year to year from September 2015. This is a change to the way that the programme is funded, as it was commissioned under a longer term contract for intakes from 2010 to 2014. Although this is a change to the funding arrangements, it does not impact on the period considered by this audit (academic years 2012–13 and 2013–14). So we can consider whether the changes to funding arrangements impact on the way the programme meets the standards, the programme team should notify us of this change via a major change submission or via their next annual monitoring audit.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Dietetics and Nutrition
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	27 May 2015

### 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) Dietetics and Nutrition Course Catalogue
  - Equality and Diversity Policy
  - Faculty of Life Sciences and Computing Business Plan 2014–15
  - School of human Sciences Performance Enhancement Meeting minutes July 2013 and July 2014
  - Health Education England Annual Report 2012–13 and 2013–14
  - Single Performance Review Policy
  - BSc (Hons) Dietetics and Nutrition Course Handbook
  - London Metropolitan university Complaints Policy

- Practice Educator Training Programme
- Placement Audit Report 2013–14
- Terms of Reference for Stakeholder Meetings
- British Dietetic Association Accreditation Certificate
- Placement Handbook
- Placement Allocation Policy

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London Metropolitan University
Programme title	MSc Dietetics and Nutrition
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	27 May 2015

### 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
  - MSc Dietetics and nutrition Course Catalogue
  - Equality and Diversity Policy
  - Faculty of Life Sciences and Computing Business Plan 2014–15
  - School of human Sciences Performance Enhancement Meeting minutes July 2013 and July 2014
  - Health Education England Annual Report 2012–13 and 2013–14
  - Single Performance Review Policy
  - MSc Dietetics and Nutrition Course Handbook
  - London Metropolitan University Complaints Policy

- Practice Educator Training Programme
- Placement Audit Report 2013–14
- Terms of Reference for Stakeholder Meetings
- British Dietetic Association Accreditation Certificate
- Placement Handbook
- Placement Allocation Policy

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London Metropolitan University
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma Dietetics and Nutrition (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	27 May 2015

### 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
- PG Dip Dietetics and nutrition Course Catalogue
- Equality and Diversity Policy
- Faculty of Life Sciences and Computing Business Plan 2014–15
- School of human Sciences Performance Enhancement Meeting minutes July 2013 and July 2014
- Health Education England Annual Report 2012–13 and 2013–14
- Single Performance Review Policy
- PG Dip Dietetics and Nutrition Course Handbook

- London Metropolitan University Complaints Policy
- Practice Educator Training Programme
- Placement Audit Report 2013–14
- Terms of Reference for Stakeholder Meetings
- British Dietetic Association Accreditation Certificate
- Placement Handbook
- Placement Allocation Policy

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London Metropolitan University
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Counselling psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Byrom
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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 and existing members of staff
  - External examiner appointment application
  - Programme leader correspondence regarding Response to External Examiner forms
  - Minutes from Performance Enhancement Meetings from the School of Psychology
  - Placement visits log 2012–14

- Examples of assessment and student submissions 2013–14
- Supervisory allocation and titles of doctoral theses of students 2012–14

### **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	University of Nottingham
Programme title	Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Peter Branson (Practitioner psychologist) Robert Stratford (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of postal review	3 March 2015

### 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
  - Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology (DAEP) course reference group minutes March 2014
  - DAEP course reference group minutes May 2013
  - DAEP general handbook
  - DAEP year one, two and three group supplement handbook
  - DAEP year one, two and three practice placement handbook
  - DAEP stakeholder evaluation

- DAEP staff review: Minutes course review meeting May and June 2014
- DAEP management meeting minutes
- DAEP assessment modules 2014–15

### **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 visitor .....	3
Section five: Visitor comments.....	3

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
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 role of HCPC visitor	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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 visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor 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 visitor noted reoccurring comments about student progression in the external examiner reports, for which any possible resulting actions have not been evidenced in this submission. For example, in Emma Munks' external examiner report for 2012–13, there is a statement urging the programme team to “review the events and scheduling which lead to the main board” (page 2). There is a follow up to this in the response section of the report stating that the programme team is “considering” changing assessments to “avoid potential difficulties with processing marks” (page 5). In the same external examiner's report from 2013–14, there is a statement that a change to the thesis / viva process is “being implemented currently” (page 4), but then there is nothing specific in the Annual Report for the programme from 2013–14 about how this is progressing. In the Annual Programme Monitoring Report and Action Plan for 2012–13 there is the statement that the “Issue with [postgraduate research] regulations is being handled by the registries at the two universities now”, but there is no particular follow up to this statement in the report for 2013–14. Therefore, specifically to this issue, but also more broadly, the visitor is unsure how comments made by the external examiners are taken into account when monitoring and evaluating the programme.

**Suggested documentation:** The visitor would like to see how the programme team has addressed the comments of the external examiners about the change in research structure and the impact on student progression and achievement. Documentation could include evidence of any actions relating to changes in research structure.

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

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitor 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 visitor 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 visitor noted that the education provider has mapped to demonstrate how the programme meets SET 3.17 (service users and carers must be involved in the programme). We only required programmes to meet this standard from September 2014 and the period considered in this audit is the academic years 2012–13 and 2013–14. Therefore, the education provider should submit information about how they meet SET 3.17 in their next annual monitoring audit.

In the Annual Programme Monitoring Report and Action Plan for 2012–13 and 2013–14 there are statements about the programme being commissioned year to year from September 2015. This is a change to the way that the programme is funded, as it was commissioned under a longer term contract for intakes from 2010 to 2014. Although this is a change to the funding arrangements, it does not impact on the period considered by this audit (academic years 2012–13 and 2013–14). So we can consider whether the changes to funding arrangements impact on the way the programme meets the standards, the programme team should notify us of this change via a major change submission or via their next annual monitoring audit.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	New School of Psychotherapy & Counselling & Middlesex University
Name of validating body	Middlesex University
Programme title	Doctorate in Counselling Psychology and Psychotherapy by Professional Studies (DCPsych)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Counselling psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Byrom
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Alison Nicholls (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	27 May 2015

### 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
  - Minor change forms
  - New module outline for P49404
  - New module outline for P49405
  - New module outline for P40613
  - New module outline for P40307

### **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	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pamela Bagley (Physiotherapist) Anthony Hoswell (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	27 May 2015

### 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
- New staff curriculum vitae
- Minor changes to existing modules 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.

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

The education provider has submitted documentation to support how this programme meets the new standard of education and training (SET 3.17), introduced in September 2014. However, for this annual monitoring audit which covers academic year 2012–13 and 2013–14, education providers are not expected to demonstrate how they meet this new standard. As such the visitors advise the education provider to submit this evidence to the next annual monitoring audit when this programme will be assessed against the new standard.

## 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 Portsmouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of postal review	28 May 2015

### 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 Portsmouth
Programme title	FdSc Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pamela Bagley (Physiotherapist) Anthony Hoswell (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	27 May 2015

### 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 visitor .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	27 May 2015

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

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

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor 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 visitor**

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitor 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 visitor 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 Portsmouth
Programme title	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jenny Ford (Speech and language therapist) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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 Portsmouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Antony Ward (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Unit mapping 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 visitor .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen's University of Belfast
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsych)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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 regulation handbook 2014–15

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

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor 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 visitor**

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitor 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 visitor 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 Reading
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 role of HCPC visitors	Jenny Ford (Speech and language therapist) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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 Reading
Programme title	MSc Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jenny Ford (Speech and language therapist) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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 .....	4

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paula Sobiechowska (Social worker in England) Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	1 April 2015

### 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 programme went through the approval process in May 2013 and has only been running from September 2013. Therefore the visitors reviewed the external examiner's report for 2013–14 academic year only, as reports from academic year 2012–13 were reviewed during the approval visit.

### **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 information provided the visitors noted that the education provider has submitted both internal and external annual monitoring documents. For the internal annual monitoring document (2013–14) the visitors were presented with a ‘programme action log’ in the format of a spreadsheet. The visitors recognised that the spreadsheet was used to flag suggested actions for the programme. However, due to the spreadsheet layout, the visitors found the ‘programme action log’ difficult to navigate through. In particular they were unable to clearly identify each suggested action any resolution associated with an action. Due to the difficulties the visitors had in assessing the evidence, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider evaluates the programme’s effectiveness using the ‘programme action log’. The visitors therefore require further clarification on the actions captured in the ‘programme action log’ and the actions taken to respond to a particular issue, to ensure that the programme has effective and regular monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence of the actions captured in the ‘programme action log’ and the action taken by the education provider.

#### **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 internal quality monitoring document (2012–13), the visitors noted that the programme has had a number of staff leave the programme and that the programme team is “made up of new members of staff”. Although HCPC does not prescribe a staff-to-student ratio, the visitors had concerns that a significant number of staff have left the programme. From the information provided the visitors were unable to make a judgement that there is an appropriate number of staff in place to deliver the programme effectively especially, considering the difficulties mentioned in the internal quality report such as lack of resources. The visitors did note that “11 new members of academic staff are now in post across the Directorate – 6 of these in the BA programme. A further 2.5 posts are to be recruited”, however, the visitors were unable to determine how many of these staff are new members and how many are replacing old members of staff. Furthermore, the visitors were not provided with any information as to who these new members of staff are or any information to determine whether these new members of staff are appropriately qualified and experienced to deliver this programme. The visitors are therefore, unable to make a judgement whether there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information on the new members of staff as well as information to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the internal quality monitoring document (2012–13), the visitors noted that the programme team is “made up of new members of staff”. The internal quality monitoring document states that “11 new members of academic staff are now in post across the Directorate – 6 of these in the BA programme. A further 2.5 posts are to be recruited”. The visitors noted the large number of new members of staff to this programme, however, the visitors were not provided with any information as to who these new members of staff are and / or any information to determine whether these new members of staff are appropriately qualified to deliver this programme. The visitors are therefore, unable to make a judgement whether subject areas continue to be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. In order for this standard to continue to be met, the visitors require further information of the specialist expertise and knowledge for the staff in place for this programme.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information to determine that subject areas are taught by staff with specialist expertise and knowledge.

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

**Reason:** The internal quality monitoring document (2012–13) highlights concerns around the resources in place to support students for this programme. Administrative support and staff resignations are referenced as having a big impact on student experience. Furthermore, the report states “additional resources to be allocated in the next workload”. The visitors have not been provided with any information as to what these resources are to support student learning. The visitors noted in the internal quality monitoring document (2012–13) that students have been frustrated with “exams, publication of results, response to queries”. The document states that this is impacting negatively on student experience and has impacted contact time with students. However, the visitors could find no further information as to the actions taken to mitigate against these issues in future, and ensure the effective use of the resources available in supporting learning.

**Suggested document:** Further information on the actions taken in response to the issues identified in the internal quality monitoring document (2012–13).

### **6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Reason:** From the information provided the visitors noted the requirements for the appointment of external examiners to this programme. However, they were unclear as to how this process had been applied. The internal quality monitoring document (2012–13) detailed that there has been some issues surrounding external examiners for this programme. Furthermore, the visitors were not provided with the external examiner report for last year and therefore could not determine how the current external examiner

arrangements ensures that there is an appropriate experienced and qualified external examiner in place.

**Suggested document:** Documentation containing information how the regulations have been applied to ensure that the external examiner for the programme are appropriately experienced and qualified.

#### **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 Salford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Integrated Practice Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paula Sobiechowska (Social worker in England) Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	1 April 2015

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

**Reason:** From the information provided the visitors noted that the education provider has submitted both internal and external annual monitoring documents. For the internal annual monitoring document (2013–14) the visitors were presented with a 'programme action log' in the format of a spreadsheet. The visitors recognised that the spreadsheet was used to flag suggested actions for the programme. However, due to the spreadsheet layout, the visitors found the 'programme action log' difficult to navigate through. In particular they were unable to clearly identify each suggested action any resolution associated with an action. Due to the difficulties the visitors had in assessing the evidence, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider evaluates the programme's effectiveness using the 'programme action log'. The visitors therefore require further clarification on the actions captured in the 'programme action log' and the actions taken to respond to a particular issue, to ensure that the programme has effective and regular monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence of the actions captured in the 'programme action log' and the action taken by the education provider.

### 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 Salford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics & Orthotics
Mode of delivery	Full Time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Prosthetist / orthotist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kevin Murray (Prosthetist / orthotist) Hazel Currie (Prosthetist / orthotist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of postal review	15 May 2015

### 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	University of Salford
Programme title	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paula Sobiechowska (Social worker in England) Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	1 April 2015

### 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 programme went through the approval process in May 2013 and only been running from September 2013. Therefore the visitors reviewed the external examiner's report for 2013–14 academic year only, as reports from academic year 2012–13 were reviewed during the approval visit.

### **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 information provided the visitors noted that the education provider has submitted both internal and external annual monitoring documents. For the internal annual monitoring document (2013–14) the visitors were presented with a 'programme action log' in the format of a spreadsheet. The visitors recognised that the spreadsheet was used to flag suggested actions for the programme. However, due to the spreadsheet layout, the visitors found the 'programme action log' difficult to navigate through. In particular they were unable to clearly identify each suggested action any resolution associated with an action. Due to the difficulties the visitors had in assessing the evidence, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider evaluates the programme's effectiveness using the 'programme action log'. The visitors therefore require further clarification on the actions captured in the 'programme action log' and the actions taken to respond to a particular issue, to ensure that the programme has effective and regular monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence of the actions captured in the 'programme action log' and the action taken by 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:** From a review of the documentation provided, the visitors noted that this programme has had a change in programme leader which needs to be assessed at this annual monitoring assessment day. The visitors were provided with the new programme leader's curriculum vitae as evidence for this standard. In assessing the curriculum vitae, the visitors were unable to determine whether the new programme leader has the appropriate qualifications and experience required and whether they have been provided with adequate support. Furthermore, the visitors were unable to determine whether the evidence submitted was the most current and up to date curriculum vitae as the last entry in the document was 2012. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the new programme leader is appropriately qualified and experienced to have overall professional responsibility for this programme.

**Suggested document:** Further evidence to show the new programme leader is appropriately qualified and experience to have overall professional responsibility for this 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	St George's, University of London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pamela Bagley (Physiotherapist) Anthony Hoswell (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	27 May 2015

### 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
  - Scheme of Assessment 2014–15

### **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	St George's, University of London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Antony Ward (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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	St George's, University of London
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pamela Bagley (Physiotherapist) Anthony Hoswell (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	27 May 2015

### 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 programme was approved by HCPC in August 2013 therefore, the required documentation for academic year 2012–13 did not exist and consequently were not submitted to HCPC.
  - The education provider has submitted external examiner's report 2013–14 for the BSc Physiotherapy programme and the response to it.
  - 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.

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation submitted that the education provider did not submit external examiner's report for academic year 2013–14 and the education provider's response to it. The visitors were unable to determine if the programme has gone through regular monitoring processes during this period. Therefore, the visitors will further document to show how the programme has gone through regular monitoring and evaluation processes during this period to be assured this standard continues to meet.

**Suggested documentation:** Information regarding the monitoring and evaluation systems in place during academic year 2013–14.

### 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	St George's, University of London
Programme title	PG Practice Cert in Supplementary Prescribing (Health Professions Council (HPC) members) Level 7
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Vince Clarke (Paramedic) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

### 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
- Validation 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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

#### B.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with the Annual monitoring report for 2012–13 and 2013–14 for the Diploma/BSc/BSc (Hons) Healthcare practice. From the Validation document provided, page 8, the visitors noted that the Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing Health Professions Council (HPC) Members (Level 7) sits as a Pathway Specific Award within MSc Advanced Practice Framework. However the visitors were unable to find annual monitoring reports specifically for the MSc Advanced Practice Framework. Within the 2012–13 Annual monitoring report for the Diploma/BSc/BSc (Hons) Health Care Practice the visitors noted the statement: “As a result of the successful validation of the MSc Healthcare Practice in July 2013 there are plans for the undergraduate and postgraduate Healthcare Practice programmes to hold Module and Pathway Leaders’ meetings jointly.” However, the visitors could find limited further information as to the monitoring of the postgraduate provision, to explicitly indicate why this annual monitoring audit submission did not appear to cover the MSc Advanced Practice Framework specifically. The visitors were unclear as to whether the annual monitoring reports submitted covered all pathways within which the Supplementary Prescribing Health Professions Council (HPC) Members (Level 7) sits, and therefore require further clarification as to the monitoring and evaluation of the programme.

**Suggested documentation:** Clarification as to where the Supplementary Prescribing Health Professions Council (HPC) Members (Level 7) currently sits within programmes and any relevant monitoring reports for each of the programmes.

### 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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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 for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers 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 Sheffield
Programme title	BMed Sci (Hons) Orthoptics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Orthoptist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Timms (Orthoptist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	29 May 2015

### 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
  - Selected programme prospectus information
  - Structure of values based recruitment process through multiple mini interviews
  - Selection process section of webpage
  - Details and webpage information about the faculty health challenge

### **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 visitor noted that the education provider has demonstrated how the programme meets SET 3.17 (service users and carers must be involved in the programme). We only required programmes to meet this standard from September 2014 and the period considered in this audit is the academic years 2012–13 and 2013–14. Therefore, the education provider should submit information about how they meet SET 3.17 in their next annual monitoring audit.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Harris (Paramedic) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	1 April 2015

### 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 amendments 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.

#### **3.4 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 noted that the 2013–14 ‘Annual Programme Report’ was signed off by Dinesh Samuel as the acting programme leader. In contrast the 2012–13 ‘Annual Programme Report’ was signed off by Richard Collier as the programme leader. The visitors noted that the education provider had not submitted a major change notification to inform the HCPC of a change to the programme leader. A change to the programme leader including an interim programme leader may have an impact on the above standard. Therefore the education provider is required to clarify who was the named person who had overall professional responsibility for the programme for academic years 2012–14. Moreover, if there has been a change to the programme leader the education provider is required to demonstrate that they are appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on the relevant part of the Register.

**Suggested documentation:** Documentation to demonstrate who the programme leader was for academic years 2012–14 such as minutes of meetings and their qualifications for the post as programme leader such as a curriculum vitae.

### 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 during the academic years looked at during this annual monitoring audit there had been temporary arrangements made to cover the position of programme leader. Although the provision of further documentation clarified these arrangements, the initial documentary submission was unclear as to who was the programme leader at what time. In future the visitors recommend that the education provider provide a clear narrative of change in annual monitoring or submit a major change notification when long term temporary arrangements 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 .....	3

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Harris (Paramedic) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	1 April 2015

### 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 amendments 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.

#### **3.4 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 noted that the 2013–14 'Annual Programme Report' was signed off by Dinesh Samuel as the acting programme leader. In contrast the 2012–13 'Annual Programme Report' was signed off by Richard Collier as the programme leader. The visitors noted that the education provider had not submitted a major change notification to inform the HCPC of a change to the programme leader. A change to the programme leader including an interim programme leader may have an impact on the above standard. Therefore the education provider is required to clarify who was the named person who had overall professional responsibility for the programme for academic years 2012–14. Moreover, if there has been a change to the programme leader the education provider is required to demonstrate that they are appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on the relevant part of the Register.

**Suggested documentation:** Documentation to demonstrate who the programme leader was for academic years 2012–14 such as minutes of meetings and their qualifications for the post as programme leader such as a curriculum vitae.

### 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 during the academic years looked at during this annual monitoring audit there had been temporary arrangements made to cover the position of programme leader. Although the provision of further documentation clarified these arrangements, the initial documentary submission was unclear as to who was the programme leader at what time. In future the visitors recommend that the education provider provide a clear narrative of change in annual monitoring or submit a major change notification when long term temporary arrangements have been made.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	PG Dip Physiotherapy (Pre- registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Harris (Paramedic) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	1 April 2015

### 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 amendments 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.

#### **3.4 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 noted that the 2013–14 'Annual Programme Report' was signed off by Dinesh Samuel as the acting programme leader. In contrast the 2012–13 'Annual Programme Report' was signed off by Richard Collier as the programme leader. The visitors noted that the education provider had not submitted a major change notification to inform the HCPC of a change to the programme leader. A change to the programme leader including an interim programme leader may have an impact on the above standard. Therefore the education provider is required to clarify who was the named person who had overall professional responsibility for the programme for academic years 2012–14. Moreover, if there has been a change to the programme leader the education provider is required to demonstrate that they are appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on the relevant part of the Register.

**Suggested documentation:** Documentation to demonstrate who the programme leader was for academic years 2012–14 such as minutes of meetings and their qualifications for the post as programme leader such as a curriculum vitae.

### Section three: 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 during the academic years looked at during this annual monitoring audit there had been temporary arrangements made to cover the position of programme leader. Although the provision of further documentation clarified these arrangements, the initial documentary submission was unclear as to who was the programme leader at what time. In future the visitors recommend that the education provider provide a clear narrative of change in annual monitoring or submit a major change notification when long term temporary arrangements 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	Staffordshire University
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Antony Ward (Health psychologist) Angela Duxbury (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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	Staffordshire University
Programme title	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jenny Ford (Speech and language therapist) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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 members of staff
  - Curriculum Vitae for new 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.

## 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 Surrey
Programme title	Practitioner Doctorate in Psychotherapeutic and Counselling Psychology (PsychD)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Counselling psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Byrom
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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 of new staff member
  - Job description for new Teaching Fellow role

### **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	Swansea University
Programme title	DipHE Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) David Packwood (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Byrom
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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 for modules SHE213 and SHE214

### **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	Swansea University
Programme title	Diploma Higher Education Paramedic Science for Emergency Medical Technicians
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) David Packwood (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Byrom
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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 for modules SHE213 and SHE214

### **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 Campus Suffolk
Name of validating body	Universities of East Anglia and Essex
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 role of HCPC visitors	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Antony Ward (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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
  - CAT form Radiation Physics and Oncology, Anatomy and Radiotherapy Practice 1

### **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 visitor .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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
  - Summary of staff changes document
  - Curriculum stakeholder Review
  - Issues of Concern Form and Flowchart
  - Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) and Placement Day Requirements
  - Learning Objectives for Case Reports and Oral Presentations
  - Covering Letter to University of East Anglia Postgraduate Research Executive outlining introduction of thesis portfolio

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

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor 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 visitor**

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitor 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 visitor 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 East Anglia
Programme title	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jenny Ford (Speech and language therapist) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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
  - Current Student handbook
  - Assessment to practice 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 visitor .....	2

### Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East 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 role of HCPC visitor	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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 visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor 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 visitor**

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitor 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 visitor 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	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Health Psychology (Professional Practice)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jane Grant (Occupational therapist) Kathryn Thirlaway (Health psychologist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	1 April 2015

### 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:** From a review of the Annual Monitoring Programme Report 2012–13 the visitors noted feedback from students which stated “No evidence on the website re the writing up fee”. The visitors note that this suggests a possible change to the programme in the way of introducing a writing up fee, or removing this information from the website. The visitors were not provided with any supporting documentation to inform them of any changes in this area and were therefore unable to confirm that this standard continues to be met. Any changes to the admission procedure such as the introduction of a writing up fee will need to be communicated to potential applicants and students of this programme. The visitors consider this to be essential information and therefore require further documentation to evidence how potential applicants are made aware of the writing up fee to ensure they have the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

**Suggested Documentation:** Updated admissions information and confirmation of any changes made in this area.

#### **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 Annual Monitoring Programme Record 2012-13 the visitors noted a statement on page one “The Health Behaviour Change Interventions module has been redesigned and is currently running for the first time with students from the 2012 cohort who will finish this module in January 2014.” The visitors were not provided any additional evidence to support this change and were therefore unable to make a judgement on how if the learning outcomes continue to ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for health psychologists. The visitors therefore require further information on the changes made to the Health Behaviour Change Interventions module, to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested Documentation:** Updated module descriptor for The Health Behaviour Change Interventions module.

#### **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 the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Counselling psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Byrom
Date of assessment day	28 May 2015

### 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 members of staff
  - Revised programme specification
  - Revised module descriptors for Qualitative and Quantitative Methods and Systemic Thinking and Practice in Counselling Psychology modules

### **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 West London
Programme title	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Andrew Steele (Operating department practitioner) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of postal review	15 June 2015

### 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
- Health Education North west London quality monitoring report

### **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.