

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 Bedfordshire
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	2 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.

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 Birmingham
Programme title	Doctorate in Forensic Psychology Practice (ForenPsyD)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner Psychologist
Relevant modality	Forensic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	George Delafield (Forensic psychologist) Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of postal review	19 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
 - Curriculum vitae for programme director, Louise Dixon

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	Bournemouth University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ann Green (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
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.

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	Bournemouth University
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	2 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.

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	Bournemouth University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	2 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.

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 Bradford
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	Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	9 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
 - Curriculum vitae for Beverley Foster
 - Module specifications
 - Professional development portfolio documents
 - Programme specification
 - Escalating concerns in practice
 - Fitness to study documents
 - Mandatory pre placement training

- Student attendance documents

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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 Bradford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	2 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
 - Programme enhancement plans
 - Programme specification updated
 - Programme handbook
 - Curriculum vitae for new staff member
 - Escalating concerns in Practice
 - Fitness to study Policy
 - Student attendance 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	University of Bradford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist) Ruth Baker (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	2 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
 - Student attendance
 - Monitoring 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 five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ann Green (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
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.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted from statements in the internal quality report 2013 – 14, that the previous School of Health Professions and the School of Nursing and Midwifery have merged from January 2014 to form the new School of Health Sciences. The BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy has therefore moved. The visitors could find no additional evidence submitted regarding this move of School, or reference to this in the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document. From the documentation submitted, the visitors could not see anything which indicated that these changes have affected the programme's continued ability to meet the SETs. However, the visitors remind the education provider that changes to programme management and resources must be highlighted to the HCPC through the appropriate monitoring processes, either through a major change notification or through the annual monitoring audit form mapping exercise, with further evidence provided if necessary. As this annual monitoring cycle is now completed for this programme, the education provider must report any changes, retrospective or prospective, that affect the way in which the programme meets the SETs through the major change process.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Sharon Wiener-Ogilvie (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	9 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.

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 Brighton
Programme title	Clinical Pharmacology
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Prescription only medicine
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Catherine Smith (Chiroprapist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	9 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
 - Course document
 - Module leads curriculum vitae
 - Academic health report
 - Module descriptor
 - Module handbook
 - Review document 2011

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist) Graham Harris (Paramedic)
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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the education provider has increased the number of students on one of its cohorts for the 2014–15 academic year, the increase is from three cohorts of 20 to three cohorts, one of 40 and two of 20. This increase of students for the cohort did not impact on how the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training for the academic years 2012–13 and 2013–14 due to the fact that the change came into place for the 2014–15 academic year. However the education provider is required to submit a major change notification for this increase in student numbers due to the potential impact on the staffing resources, learning resources and practice placements.

The visitors noted from statements in the internal quality report 2013 – 14, that the previous School of Health Professions and the School of Nursing and Midwifery have merged from January 2014 to form the new School of Health Sciences. The BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice programme has therefore moved. The visitors could find no additional evidence submitted regarding this move of School, or reference to this in the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document. From the documentation submitted, the visitors could not see anything which indicated that these changes have affected the programme's continued ability to meet the SETs. However, the visitors remind the education provider that changes to programme management and resources must be highlighted to the HCPC through the appropriate monitoring processes, either through a major change notification or through the annual monitoring audit form mapping exercise, with further evidence provided if necessary. As this annual monitoring cycle is now

completed for this programme, the education provider must report any changes, retrospective or prospective, that affect the way in which the programme meets the SETs through the major change process.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Brunel University
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	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist) Elsbeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	18 February 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
 - Board of studies minutes 2013
 - Board of studies minutes 2014

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the internal annual monitoring reports for 2012–13 and 2013–14, and the board of studies minutes from October 2013 and October 2014, that there were concerns over staffing for the programme. Specifically the visitors noted the concerns about staffing levels and workload demands. The visitors noted that the education provider has recruited new staff members and reviewed workload plans, but they did not include details of these changes in their submission. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine if there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme. To ensure this standard continues to be met, the visitors require further documentation to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: The visitors would like to see staff CVs, the department structure, new workload plans, and any other documentation to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the education provider are in the process of recruiting staff and would like to remind the education provider that they should notify the HCPC about any significant changes to the number of teaching staff in the future through the major change process.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Brunel University
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	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	17 February 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
- Programme Specification
 - Module outlines
 - Tutoring at Brunel Guidelines

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the internal annual monitoring reports 2012–13 and 2013–14 that there had been issues over staffing for the programme. The reports did not clearly indicate how the staffing issues were being addressed. Therefore the visitors were unclear as to what efforts had been made to recruit further staff to ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: A strategy to demonstrate how the education provider intends to recruit staff to that ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

Whilst reading the documentation the visitors noted that a new programme leader is to be in place from April 2015. As this is outside the period that we are considering for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors did not consider the curriculum vitae for the programme leader which was enclosed in the documentation. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that a change to the programme leader should be noted to the HCPC by submitting a major change notification.

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	Brunel 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	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	17 February 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

- Programme specification
- Module outlines
- Tutoring@Brunel Guidelines

As this programme is now in its second year the quality assurance documentation is only available for the past full academic year 2013-14

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the internal annual monitoring report 2013–14 that there had been issues over staffing for the programme. The report did not clearly indicate how the staffing issues were being addressed. Therefore the visitors were unclear as to what efforts had been made to recruit further staff to ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: A strategy to demonstrate how the education provider intends to recruit staff to that ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
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) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	2 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.

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	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jane Grant (Occupational therapist) Kathryn Thiraway (Practitioner 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.

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	Canterbury Christ Church 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	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	2 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
 - Curriculum vitae for new member of staff
 - Practice Education Management System academic user guide
 - Practice Education Management System student user guide

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	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	2 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
 - Curriculum vitae for new member of staff
 - Practice Education Management System academic user guide
 - Practice Education Management System student user guide

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	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
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
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Programme validation documentation
 - Information on the changes to the curriculum

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	Centre for Psychotherapy (Belfast Health and Social Care Trust)
Name of validating body	University of East London
Programme title	MSc Art Psychotherapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Art therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Janek Dubowski (Art therapist) Phillipa Brown (Art therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of postal review	25 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
 - Programme handbook
 - Clinical placement handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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 Central Lancashire
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
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.

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 Central Lancashire
Programme title	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
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.

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 Central Lancashire
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
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.

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 Central Lancashire
Programme title	Dip HE Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist) David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	9 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
 - Programme leader reports for one year ago
 - Programme leader report for two years ago
 - Module descriptors for level four and five
 - Programme student handbook
 - School of health student handbook
 - School of health manual

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	Coventry University
Programme title	Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist) David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	9 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.

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) Physiotherapy
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
 - HWTP6002 Module descriptor
 - Programme specification

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	De Montfort University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Human Communication – 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	Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist) David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	9 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
 - Student handbook for 2013-14

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	9 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
 - Programme committee meeting minutes

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 Hertfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	9 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
 - Revised School of Health and Social Work Disclosure and Barring Service policy
 - Revised Structure School of Health and Social Work
 - Curriculum Vitae for Karen Atkinson, Professional Lead for Physiotherapy commenced January 2015
 - School of Health and Social Work Personal Tutor role descriptor
 - School of Health and Social Work Placement Complaints Policy
 - School of Health and Social Work Student Handbook/Frequently Asked Question format
 - BSc(Hons) Physiotherapy Programme handbook Section 7 page 11

- School of Health and Social Work Fitness to Practise Policy
- Revised Module Descriptor for 4HSK0007 Foundations for Physiotherapy practice
- Revised Module Descriptor for 5HSK0014 Research methods
- Revised Module Descriptor for 5HSK0019 Practice Education 2- Service Improvement
- BSc(Hons) Physiotherapy Programme Specification 2014-15
- UH Physioplacements Practice placement audit form
- Revised Placement assessment form for Level 4a
- Revised Placement assessment form for Level 4
- Revised Placement assessment form for Level 5
- Revised Placement assessment form for Level 6
- Example of a Practice newsletter for placement providers

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 Hertfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist) David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	9 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
 - Curriculum vitae for new members of staff
 - Curriculum vitae for new programme leader
 - Advertisement material for new member of staff
 - Letter confirming appointment of the new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
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	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Russell Hart (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	2 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.

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 Hertfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Russell Hart (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	2 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
 - Curriculum vitae for new staff
 - Student code of conduct
 - Letter from East of England regarding placement provision
 - Sample placement audit
 - Sample placement training schedule and placement provider's training policy
 - Nomination form for external examiner

The internal quality report for another programme at the education provider; Bioscience programme was included, but the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences)

programme did not commence until September 2014. There are therefore no internal quality reports or external examiner reports and responses to be reviewed for this programme.

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 Hertfordshire
Programme title	Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist) David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	9 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
 - Curriculum vitae for new members of staff
 - Curriculum vitae for new programme leader
 - Advertisement material for new member of staff
 - Letter confirming appointment of the new programme leader

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
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) Jonathan Isserow (Art therapist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of postal review	7 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
 - CV 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 Hertfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Maureen Henderson (Dietitian) Martin Benwell (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	9 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
 - A-Z of the University of Hertfordshire
 - Policies
 - Student handbook
 - British Dietetic Association annual monitoring 2014
 - Placement annual audit
 - Practice placement pack 2014–15
 - Student handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	2 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

There are no external examiners report's available for the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice as the programme only commenced in September 2013 so this first cohort.

- Curriculum vitae for staff changes
- Modules proposed for September 2015

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the education provider had included module descriptors and standards of proficiency mapping for modules to be introduced in September 2015. As the modules are for the next academic year the visitors did not consider them as they are outside the annual monitoring review period covered by this report. The visitors also noted that the modules had been mapped to the previous standards of proficiency. The modules should be mapped against the standards of proficiency published in June 2014. The visitors therefore advise the education provider to resubmit the modules and any other supporting documentation via the major change process, so that visitors can consider the changes appropriately.

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 Huddersfield
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jane Grant (Occupational therapist) Kathryn Thirlaway (Practitioner 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
 - Curriculum vitae for Joanne Carruthers
 - Module specifications with track changes and copy of the rationale documents for the following modules:
 - HIG1001 - Interprofessional Working in context.
 - HIT2001 - Enhancing Occupational Performance for Individuals and Groups
 - Programme specification

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Local anaesthetic Prescription only medicine
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	9 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.

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 Huddersfield
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	9 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
 - Programme Specification
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - HHG1000 Module Specification
 - HIG1000 Module Specification

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme title	Clinical Pharmacology for Podiatrists
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Prescription only medicine
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	9 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

There is only documentation for two years ago for this programme as the module specification HMP1004 is only offered on alternate academic years due to the MSc course structure and student numbers.

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 Hull
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	2 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
- Course handbook
- Staffing structure department
- Trainee consent form for participation in Clinical Skills Training

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

During the assessment of the documentation, the visitors noted the comment made on SET 3.4 in the SETs mapping document. The visitors acknowledged the comment in the mapping document which directs them to the major change submitted in March 2015, regarding the change in the named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme. However, the visitors wished to point out that the change in the named person will be assessed via the major change process not via this annual monitoring assessment day as it falls outside the remit of this annual monitoring.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Lancaster
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	Dorothy Smith (Social worker in England) Antony Ward (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	17 February 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
- Additional Docs Lancaster University Annual Monitoring

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 and internal quality 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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation provided included module outlines for SWK.115, SWK.116, SWK.420, SWK425 and SWK.378b each with several changes made to them. There was also a standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping document which showed the SOPs mapped against module titles. However, the education provider did not provide all the module descriptors cited in the mapping document. The education provider also did not provide further details of the changes made to these modules, including how the modules used to deliver the SOPs to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. The visitors also noted in the annual monitoring audit mapping document that the education provider has made changes to the module SWK.378 from October 2013. However, the education provider will offer all subsequent years' students the originally approved SWK.378 Mental Health approved in May 2013. The visitors therefore could not determine what changes were made to the modules, and how the programme continues to meet this standard.

Suggested documentation: A detailed breakdown of how each SOP is delivered in relation to the learning outcomes of the revised modules in relation to previously.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation provided included module outlines for SWK.115, SWK.116, SWK.420, SWK425 and SWK.378b each with several changes, including changes to assessment, made to them. However, the education provider did not provide all the modules descriptors and the details of the assessments cited in the mapping document. The education provider also did not provide further details of the changes made to the assessment of these modules including how the modules are used to assess the SOPs. The visitors also noted in the annual monitoring audit mapping document that the education provider has made changes to the module SWK.378 since October 2013. However, the education provider will offer all subsequent years' students the originally approved SWK.378 Mental Health from May 2013. The visitors could not determine what changes have been made to the modules and how the programme continues to meet this standard.

Suggested documentation: A detailed breakdown of how each SOP is assessed in relation to the learning outcomes of the modules.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the education provider has made a number of changes to the programme since its approval in 2013. However, the education provider did not notify HCPC regarding these changes until this monitoring submission. The visitors would like to encourage the education provider to use the major change process in future whenever significant changes are made to the programmes that will affect the way the SETs are met.

The visitors also suggest that the education provider make submissions separately for each programme, clearly articulating the documentation related to particular programmes for future annual monitoring.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Lancaster
Programme title	MA Social Work with Religious Studies
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dorothy Smith (Social worker in England) Antony Ward (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	17 February 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 education provider has indicated this programme has not run since its approval in 2013.

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted from the annual monitoring submission for the BA (Hons) Social Work, MA Social Work and Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work cover page, that "The M Social Work (Hons) Social Work, Ethics & Religion is due to commence in 2015–16". The education provider did not submit any documentation related to this programme in particular. Therefore the visitors were unable to make a decision as to how this programme continues to meet this standard. The visitors will need evidence in relation to this standard to make a judgement about this programme's ongoing approval.

Suggested documentation: Documentation evidencing this programme has a secure place in the business plan of the education provider.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Reason: Although this standard was met when the programme was approved in May 2013, the visitors noted in the documentation that this programme has not run since its approval. In addition, the visitors did not see any evidence particular to this programme to show how it continues to meet this standard. Therefore the education provider will need to submit evidence of how the curriculum of this programme is still relevant to current practice. This request is linked to the request set under standard 3.1.

Suggested documentation: Documentation evidencing review of the curriculum on a regular basis.

5.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: The education provider has indicated this programme has not run since its approval in May 2013. In addition, the visitors did not see any evidence particular to this programme showing this programme continues to meet this standard. Therefore the education provider will need to submit evidence of how this programme continues to implement a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Suggested documentation: Documentation suggesting review of the programme on a regular basis including practice placements.

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

Reason: The education provider has indicated this programme has not run since its approval in May 2013. In addition, the visitors did not see any evidence particular to this

programme showing it continues to meet this standard. Therefore the education provider will need to submit evidence that there are monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Suggested documentation: Documentation showing review of the programme on a regular basis takes place, including assessment standards.

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 suggest the education provider ensures documentary submissions are made separately for each programme, clearly articulating which documents are related to each programme for future annual monitoring.

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 Leeds
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	9 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
 - SCoR CPD event endorsement of internal examiner (Clinical Assessor) training 2014
 - UCAS Shortlisting and Interview Checklist

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 Leeds
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
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) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	2 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
 - Programme handbook 2014–15
 - Curriculum vitae for Charlotte Baker
 - Utilising Practice Based Evidence (PBE) principle in supervision steering group annual report 2014

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	2 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
- NSS table for the School which covers statistics for past two years
- Mapping document to HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs) for occupational therapists as appendix to updated Programme Specification with minor changes noted in Annex 1
- College of Occupational Therapists Annual Monitoring Report 2012-13

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the education provider had provided a revised standards of proficiency mapping. As the annual monitoring review period does not cover the revised standards of proficiency, the mapping could not be considered at this time. The revised standards of proficiency will be considered at the next audit for this programme and the education provider should resubmit the mapping at this time.

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 Liverpool
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin.Psychol)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Stephen Davies (Clinical psychologist) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	17 February 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 final report of a formal review of the programme undertaken by the Institute of Learning and Teaching in 2013–14 was submitted in place of internal quality reports, as the programme is now classified as a postgraduate research programme and is no longer the subject of the University's Annual Programme Monitoring system
- Job description for University Clinical Teacher
- Information for students on increase to their conference and book allowance

- Minor Modifications to the programme document submitted to the Faculty's Academic Quality Standards Committee (FAQSC)
- FAQSC minutes (7 September 2012)
- New Supervisor's Assessment of Trainee forms
- Minutes of Clinical sub-group meetings
- Minutes of Curriculum Planning meetings
- Report on external examiner coursework moderation for 2012–2013 and 2013–2014
- Letter to internal markers outlining new marking procedure
- External examiner appointment evidence

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that Jennifer Wild's external examiners' report for 2012–13 academic year was not submitted. The education provider also did not provide internal quality monitoring reports for the last two years, and the visitors noted the programme is now classified as a postgraduate research programme and is no longer the subject of the University's Annual Programme Monitoring system. The final report of a formal review of the programme undertaken by the Institute of Learning and Teaching in 2013–14 was provided. The visitors could not find a quality report specific to the academic year 2012–13. The formal review report outlines the future actions for monitoring from the 2014–15 academic year onwards on page 9; "To address the internal quality assurance processes of the Faculty, the Director of Studies should submit, in February each year, an Annual Subject Review (ASR) report (based on the ASR for post-graduate programmes) to the Board of Studies of the School of Psychology". However, from the documentation submitted, the visitors were unable to determine the annual or routine monitoring processes which have been used specifically over the past two academic years to evaluate the programme's ongoing effectiveness, including monitoring of feedback from key stakeholders, review of key indicators and currency of curriculum. The visitors therefore require further documentation from the education provider in order to carry out the HCPC annual monitoring process for this submission, and ensure this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Key reporting information from the past two academic years, for example, student feedback, progression data and review, all external examiner reports (or explanation as to why this is unavailable) and evidence of robust monitoring processes in place.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	2 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
 - Programme specification 2014–15
 - Student handbook 2014–15
 - School of health sciences attendance policy
 - Module specification PHTY225 Research Skills 2
 - Minutes of clinical managers meetings
 - Rolling programme for practice placement education
 - National Students Survey results 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 Liverpool
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Russell Hart (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	2 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
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Programme specification
 - Module descriptors
 - Standards of proficiency mapping

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London Metropolitan University
Programme title	Profession Doctorate in Health Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Thirlaway (Health psychologist) Jane Grant (Occupational therapist)
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.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the guidance on page one of the Subject Standards Examiner Annual Report, October 2013 states "Finally, please note that individual staff and students must not be named in your report". However, page seven of the same document states the full names and assignment results of four different students. The visitors would like to recommend that the education provider ensures that their own policies around student confidentiality are upheld in external examiner reports.

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	Mary Hare
Name of validating body	Edexcel
Programme title	Higher National Diploma Hearing Aid Audiology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	9 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 education provider submitted one external examiner report covering both academic years. They did not submit a response to this report. However, they submitted the external verifier's reports from Edexcel for both academic years and the responses to them.

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 in the SETs mapping document that the education provider has highlighted the revised standards of proficiency as evidence to support this programme continues to meet SET 4.5. This is incorrect as this standard is about students' understanding of the implications of the HCPC standards of conduct performance and ethics as opposed to the standards of proficiency. The visitor was content that this standard continues to be met, however, the visitor suggests that the education provider should complete the SETs mapping document with accurate wording in the future.

The visitor also noted that the external examiner report from Curtis J Alcock is not academic year specific as it states 2012–14 and covers two years. However, they submitted the external verifier's reports from Edexcel for both academic years and responses to these reports. The visitor suggests that the education provider should submit external examiner's report specific to academic years in the future with corresponding responses. Additionally, the visitor suggests that future external examiners' reports make specific references to the areas of the programme considered.

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	Newcastle University
Programme title	MSc Language Pathology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist) David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	9 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
- Programme handbook
 - Fitness to practice procedures
 - Internal subject review report
 - Rough guides to clinical and professional education
 - Degree programme specifications
 - Degree programme regulations

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the education provider submitted documents which relate to the 2014-15 academic year. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that an annual monitoring audit looks at the previous two academic years, not the current academic year. In future the education provider should submit documentation which relates to the academic years being reviewed in the 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	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Newcastle University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Sciences
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist) David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	9 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
- Programme handbook 2014-15
- The rough guide to clinical and professional education
- Speech and language science generic handbook 2014-15
- Fitness to practice procedure
- Internal Subject Review report
- Programme specifications
- Programme regulations
- Fitness to study procedure

- Clinical induction slides
- Clinical placement health and safety policy
- Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists National Standards for practice based learning
- Programme of clinical education workshops 2014-15
- Clinical Educator packs

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the education provider submitted documents which relate to the 2014-15 academic year. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that an annual monitoring audit looks at the previous two academic years, not the current academic year. In future the education provider should submit documentation which relates to the academic years being reviewed in the 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	University of Nottingham
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
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
 - University strategic plan
 - Dyslexia support information
 - Link to new reusable learning objects

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	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	2 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

This programme was first approved by HCPC in November 2012 for September 2013 intake. Since then the programme has not run therefore, there are no internal quality reports for academic year 2012–13 and 2013–14. Similarly, there are no external examiner reports and responses to those external examiner reports the same period. However, the visitors reviewed all the required documentation for the Dip HE Operating Department Practice as the other programme in the provision.

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted in the documentation that the programme has not run since it was approved in September 2012. The visitors also noted in the documentation that there are no plans to run this programme in September 2015 either. Therefore the visitors suggest the education provider keep reviewing the viability of this programme and inform HCPC in due course if / when changes occur to 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 visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Brooks University
Programme title	FdSc Paramedic Emergency Care
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
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
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Programme handbook
 - Module handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
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) Paula Sobiechowska (Social worker in England)
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
 - Minor change forms
 - New module outlines

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 Brooks University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
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
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Information about service user and carer involvement
 - Updated module outlines
 - Information on new resources

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 internal quality document for one year was signed off by Sally Feaver as the programme leader. It was also noted that the response to the external examiner report for 2013–14 academic year was signed off by Sally Feaver again but as the acting programme leader rather than the programme leader. However the education provider's documentation stated that Carolyn Maison is the current programme leader. It was also noted that the education provider had not submitted a major change to notify the HCPC that there has been a change to the programme leader. The visitors were unable to establish who the programme leader was for the academic years looked at during this annual monitoring submission. The visitors therefore require clarification as to who was the named person who had overall professional responsibility for the programme for the academic years reviewed during this annual monitoring audit. Moreover if there has been a change to the programme leader the visitors require evidence 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, to include information on their appropriate qualification and experience, 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.

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	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	2 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
 - Curriculum vitae for two staff members
 - Module outline for U43744

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 Salford
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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the internal annual monitoring document (2013 – 2014) was a 'programme action log' document in the format of a spreadsheet as evidence of monitoring. The visitors recognised that the spreadsheet was used to flag actions needed on the programme. However, the visitors noted that the 'programme action log' document was presented in the format of a spreadsheet which had columns, and that in future annual monitoring audits that this format might be problematic for visitors to understand the monitoring and evaluation outcomes. Therefore it is recommended that in future audit submissions the education provider revise the way that they present the monitoring of issues and respective actions for resolution.

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 Southampton
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsychol)
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) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	2 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
 - Curriculum vitae for Emma Hines and Peter Lawrence
 - Hand out for day four of the new supervisors' workshops
 - Hand out for day three new workshop
 - Reciprocal agreement between the University of Southampton and Bath concerning trainee support
 - Letter to Nick Donnelly approving major change (appointment of Lusia Stopa as PD)

- Copy of the letter to Jessica Corner regarding strategic contract review between University of Southampton and HEE

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 Southampton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Local anaesthetic Prescription only medicine
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	9 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

No external examiner report, or response to the report has been provided for 2013 -2014 as the external examiner did not provide a report and their contract was terminated. A letter and curriculum vitae for the newly appointed external examiner has been provided in the evidence.

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 Southampton
Programme title	Health Psychology Research and Professional Practice (MPhil)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Thirlaway (Health psychologist) Jane Grant (Occupational therapist)
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
 - Faculty Research Student Handbook

The education provider did not provide responses to external examiner reports as this level of qualification does not apply this process.

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 Southampton
Programme title	Health Psychology Research and Professional Practice (PhD)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Thirlaway (Health psychologist) Jane Grant (Occupational therapist)
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
 - Faculty Research Student Handbook

The education provider did not provide responses to external examiner reports as this level of qualification does not apply this process.

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	Staffordshire University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	18 February 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.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: From a review of the annual monitoring reports for the academic year 2012–13 and 2013–14, the visitors noted comments about staffing levels and how it is continually proving to be problematic to the overall management of the programme. This includes the workload for technicians and the pressure on experienced staff due to high demand of student numbers as some staff are restricted in their ability to move beyond the teaching based activities. The visitors noted action plans under section 8 and 10 concerning a bid for further full time academic posts. However, they found a lack of clarity in the details of the number of posts and the completions date for the appointments. The visitors were unclear as to how this programme continues to be effectively managed and how the programme continues to meet this standard.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the plans for recruiting additional full time staff and how the problems identified in the annual monitoring reports has been addressed.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted in the documentation that the education provider has completed the audit mapping document with 'N/a' without providing any additional commentary. The visitors suggest to the education provider to clearly articulate if any changes or no changes have been made to the programmes in the future submission annual monitoring.

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 Sunderland
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Russell Hart (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	2 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.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the submission included the programme specification and module descriptors for the programme with the internal quality reports, which also covered several other programmes at the education provider. The visitors noted what seemed to be terminology inconsistencies in the ways the programmes are referenced and recorded – the programme titles listed, modes of study (full time or part time) and honours in particular. To aid the visitors in reviewing changes to each programme, the visitors advise the education provider to ensure that for future annual monitoring submissions, the required quality reporting information specific to each programme is clearly signposted and referenced.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sunderland
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Russell Hart (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	2 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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted from the internal quality report for 2013–14, that, “The programme tried to recruit new students into level 1 but no placements were offered”, described as ‘disappointing’ by the education provider. The report then states that the issue of no placements was discussed with the commissioning body considering different formats for the teaching year, such as day release or block placements, which were not accepted by the commissioning body. From this evidence, the visitors could not see that there had been successful action taken to address the issues experienced with placements which had led to non-recruitment to the programme, and that there continued to be effective collaborative arrangements in place with Health Education North East. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the programme has a secure place in the business plan and continues to recruit and be a viable programme.

Suggested documentation: Further information of the approach taken to this risk to the programmes viability and evidence of the ongoing partnership arrangements as to how this will enable future recruitment of students onto the programme.

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the internal quality report for 2013–14, that, “The programme tried to recruit new students into level 1 but no placements were offered”, described as ‘disappointing’ by the education provider. The report also states that the issue of no placements was discussed with the commissioning body considering different formats for the teaching year, such as day release or block placements, which were not accepted by the commissioning body. From this evidence, the visitors could not see that there had been successful action taken to address the issues experienced with placements which had led to non-recruitment to the programme, and that there continued to be effective collaborative arrangements in place with Health Education North East. The visitors therefore require further evidence that there is security of placements offered on the programme, and that there are ongoing partnership arrangements in place with practice placement providers to enable the programme to continue with placements as an integral part.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of the ongoing partnership arrangements and how this will enable future recruitment of students on to the programme with secure placements.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the submission included the programme specification and module descriptors for the programme with the internal quality reports, which also covered several other programmes at the education provider. The visitors noted what seemed to be terminology inconsistencies in the ways the programmes are referenced and recorded – the programme titles listed, modes of study (full time or part time) and honours in particular. To aid the visitors in reviewing changes to each programme, the visitors advise the education provider to ensure that for future annual monitoring submissions, the required quality reporting information specific to each programme is clearly signposted and referenced. The visitors also could not find student feedback reporting included in this submission, though other Healthcare Science programmes at the education provider did include information within the internal quality report. The visitors recommend that student feedback reporting is included in future submissions for this programme to provide a full view for the monitoring process.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sunderland
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cellular Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Russell Hart (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	2 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
- There was no internal quality report submitted for 2013 – 14 as the programme did not run.

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the submission included the programme specification and module descriptors for the programme with the internal quality reports, which also covered several other programmes at the education provider. The visitors noted what seemed to be terminology inconsistencies in the ways the programmes are referenced and recorded – the programme titles listed, modes of study (full time or part time) and honours in particular. To aid the visitors in reviewing changes to each programme, the visitors advise the education provider to ensure that for future annual monitoring submissions, the required quality reporting information specific to each programme is clearly signposted and referenced.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sunderland
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Russell Hart (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	2 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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted from the internal quality report for 2013–14, that, “The programme tried to recruit new students into level 1 but no placements were offered”, described as ‘disappointing’ by the education provider. The report then states that the issue of no placements was discussed with the commissioning body considering different formats for the teaching year, such as day release or block placements, which were not accepted by the commissioning body. From this evidence, the visitors could not see that there had been successful action taken to address the issues experienced with placements which had led to non-recruitment to the programme, and that there continued to be effective collaborative arrangements in place with Health Education North East. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the programme has a secure place in the business plan and continues to recruit and be a viable programme.

Suggested documentation: Further information of the approach taken to this risk to the programmes viability and evidence of the ongoing partnership arrangements as to how this will enable future recruitment of students onto the programme.

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the internal quality report for 2013–14, that, “The programme tried to recruit new students into level 1 but no placements were offered”, described as ‘disappointing’ by the education provider. The report also states that the issue of no placements was discussed with the commissioning body considering different formats for the teaching year, such as day release or block placements, which were not accepted by the commissioning body. From this evidence, the visitors could not see that there had been successful action taken to address the issues experienced with placements which had led to non-recruitment to the programme, and that there continued to be effective collaborative arrangements in place with Health Education North East. The visitors therefore require further evidence that there is security of placements offered on the programme, and that there are ongoing partnership arrangements in place with practice placement providers to enable the programme to continue with placements as an integral part.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of the ongoing partnership arrangements and how this will enable future recruitment of students on to the programme with secure placements.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the submission included the programme specification and module descriptors for the programme with the internal quality reports, which also covered several other programmes at the education provider. The visitors noted what seemed to be terminology inconsistencies in the ways the programmes are referenced and recorded – the programme titles listed, modes of study (full time or part time) and honours in particular. To aid the visitors in reviewing changes to each programme, the visitors advise the education provider to ensure that for future annual monitoring submissions, the required quality reporting information specific to each programme is clearly signposted and referenced.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sunderland
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Russell Hart (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	2 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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted from the internal quality report for 2013–14, that, “The programme tried to recruit new students into level 1 but no placements were offered”, described as ‘disappointing’ by the education provider. The report then states that the issue of no placements was discussed with the commissioning body considering different formats for the teaching year, such as day release or block placements, which were not accepted by the commissioning body. From this evidence, the visitors could not see that there had been successful action taken to address the issues experienced with placements which had led to non-recruitment to the programme, and that there continued to be effective collaborative arrangements in place with Health Education North East. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the programme has a secure place in the business plan and continues to recruit and be a viable programme.

Suggested documentation: Further information of the approach taken to this risk to the programmes viability and evidence of the ongoing partnership arrangements as to how this will enable future recruitment of students onto the programme.

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the internal quality report for 2013–14, that, “The programme tried to recruit new students into level 1 but no placements were offered”, described as ‘disappointing’ by the education provider. The report also states that the issue of no placements was discussed with the commissioning body considering different formats for the teaching year, such as day release or block placements, which were not accepted by the commissioning body. From this evidence, the visitors could not see that there had been successful action taken to address the issues experienced with placements which had led to non-recruitment to the programme, and that there continued to be effective collaborative arrangements in place with Health Education North East. The visitors therefore require further evidence that there is security of placements offered on the programme, and that there are ongoing partnership arrangements in place with practice placement providers to enable the programme to continue with placements as an integral part.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of the ongoing partnership arrangements and how this will enable future recruitment of students on to the programme with secure placements.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the submission included the programme specification and module descriptors for the programme with the internal quality reports, which also covered several other programmes at the education provider. The visitors noted what seemed to be terminology inconsistencies in the ways the programmes are referenced and recorded – the programme titles listed, modes of study (full time or part time) and honours in particular. To aid the visitors in reviewing changes to each programme, the visitors advise the education provider to ensure that for future annual monitoring submissions, the required quality reporting information specific to each programme is clearly signposted and referenced.

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 Surrey
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (PsychD)
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) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	2 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
 - Programme handbook
 - Periodic review
 - Curriculum vitae of new members of staff

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Surrey
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Nutrition/Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Maureen Henderson (Dietitian) Martin Benwell (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	9 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.

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 East London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatric Medicine
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Sharon Wiener-Ogilvie (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	9 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.

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 East London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Sharon Wiener-Ogilvie (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	9 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.

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 East London
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	Ann Green (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
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.

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 comments on page 4 of the subject area Review & Enhancement Process Report 2013 – 14, regarding upcoming reductions in staffing levels. This is in response to the decreased student contract numbers and in consideration of the financial viability of the programme. This change falls outside of the period covered by this annual monitoring review, but the visitors remind the education provider that any changes which would affect the way in which the programme meets the standards of education and training must be reported to the HCPC through the major change process.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science (Clinical)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ann Green (Physiotherapist) David Houliston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
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
- ePortfolio development document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
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	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Russell Hart (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	2 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.

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	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ann Green (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
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.

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	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ann Green (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
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.

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	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ann Green (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
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.

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	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Tissue Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ann Green (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
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.

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 of England, Bristol
Programme title	BSc (Hons) 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) Paula Sobiechowska (Social worker in England)
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.

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	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	9 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.

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	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ann Green (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
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
 - Curriculum vitae for new staff members

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 the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	MA Music Therapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Music therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Sarah Brand (Arts therapist) Pauline Etkin (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of postal review	2 February 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
 - Student programme handbook
 - staff Curriculum Vitae
 - module specifications
 - External examiner's supplementary report – Bologna collaboration.

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 the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	MSc Radiotherapy & Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Russell Hart (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	2 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.

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.