

Annual monitoring 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	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work (Cambridge)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gerry Mulcahy (Social worker in England) Donald Wetherick (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
 - Internal quality report for one year ago
 - Internal quality report for two years ago
 - External examiner's report for one year ago
 - External examiner's report for two years ago
 - Response to external examiner's report one year ago
 - Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- CVs
 - Student course handbook
 - Practice placement guide and workbook
 - Quality assurance in practice learning

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to 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 standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document directed visitors to a list of module amendments in Appendix 15. From their review of this the visitors noted numerous changes that had been made since September 2013, including amendments to learning outcomes and assessments. As part of the evidence submitted the visitors were not provided with any further information detailing the substantive changes that had been made. Therefore they were unable to determine whether the changes to the learning outcomes continue to allow those students who successfully complete the programme to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the standards of proficiency continue to be delivered through the learning outcomes of the programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence which demonstrates how the learning outcomes continue to ensure that graduates meet the standards of proficiency.

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 standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document directed visitors to a list of module amendments in Appendix 15. From their review of this the visitors noted numerous changes that had been made since September 2013, including amendments to learning outcomes and assessments. As part of the evidence submitted the visitors were not provided with any further information detailing the substantive changes that had been made. Therefore they were unable to determine whether the changes to the assessments continued to ensure that those students who successfully complete the programme to meet the learning outcomes, and therefore the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the standards of proficiency continue to be assessed.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence which demonstrate how the assessments continue to ensure that the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency are met by graduates of the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted, in Appendix 15, changes to the learning outcomes and assessments which would apply from the academic year 2015–16. As this annual monitoring audit reviewed the academic years 2012–13 and 2013–14, they did not review these changes. The visitors would therefore recommend to the education provider that they consider informing the HCPC of these changes 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	3
Section five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work (Chelmsford)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gerry Mulcahy (Social worker in England) Donald Wetherick (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - CVs
 - Student course handbook
 - Practice placement guide and workbook
 - Quality assurance in practice learning

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to 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 standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document directed visitors to a list of module amendments in Appendix 15. From their review of this the visitors noted numerous changes that had been made since September 2013, including amendments to learning outcomes and assessments. As part of the evidence submitted the visitors were not provided with any further information detailing the substantive changes that had been made. Therefore they were unable to determine whether the changes to the learning outcomes continue to allow those students who successfully complete the programme to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the standards of proficiency continue to be delivered through the learning outcomes of the programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence which demonstrates how the learning outcomes continue to ensure that graduates meet the standards of proficiency.

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 standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document directed visitors to a list of module amendments in Appendix 15. From their review of this the visitors noted numerous changes that had been made since September 2013, including amendments to learning outcomes and assessments. As part of the evidence submitted the visitors were not provided with any further information detailing the substantive changes that had been made. Therefore they were unable to determine whether the changes to the assessments continued to ensure that those students who successfully complete the programme to meet the learning outcomes, and therefore the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the standards of proficiency continue to be assessed.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence which demonstrate how the assessments continue to ensure that the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency are met by graduates of the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted, in Appendix 15, changes to the learning outcomes and assessments which would apply from the academic year 2015–16. As this annual monitoring audit reviewed the academic years 2012–13 and 2013–14, they did not review these changes. The visitors would therefore recommend to the education provider that they consider informing the HCPC of these changes 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	3
Section five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work (Peterborough)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gerry Mulcahy (Social worker in England) Donald Wetherick (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - CVs
 - Student course handbook
 - Practice placement guide and workbook
 - Quality assurance in practice learning

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to 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 standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document directed visitors to a list of module amendments in Appendix 15. From their review of this the visitors noted numerous changes that had been made since September 2013, including amendments to learning outcomes and assessments. As part of the evidence submitted the visitors were not provided with any further information detailing the substantive changes that had been made. Therefore they were unable to determine whether the changes to the learning outcomes continue to allow those students who successfully complete the programme to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the standards of proficiency continue to be delivered through the learning outcomes of the programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence which demonstrates how the learning outcomes continue to ensure that graduates meet the standards of proficiency.

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 standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document directed visitors to a list of module amendments in Appendix 15. From their review of this the visitors noted numerous changes that had been made since September 2013, including amendments to learning outcomes and assessments. As part of the evidence submitted the visitors were not provided with any further information detailing the substantive changes that had been made. Therefore they were unable to determine whether the changes to the assessments continued to ensure that those students who successfully complete the programme to meet the learning outcomes, and therefore the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the standards of proficiency continue to be assessed.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence which demonstrate how the assessments continue to ensure that the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency are met by graduates of the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted, in Appendix 15, changes to the learning outcomes and assessments which would apply from the academic year 2015–16. As this annual monitoring audit reviewed the academic years 2012–13 and 2013–14, they did not review these changes. The visitors would therefore recommend to the education provider that they consider informing the HCPC of these changes 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	3
Section five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme title	MA Social Work (Cambridge)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gerry Mulcahy (Social worker in England) Donald Wetherick (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - CVs
 - Student course handbook
 - Practice placement guide and workbook
 - Quality assurance in practice learning

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to 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 standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document directed visitors to a list of module amendments in Appendix 15. From their review of this the visitors noted numerous changes that had been made since September 2013, including amendments to learning outcomes and assessments and a new optional level 6 module. As part of the evidence submitted the visitors were not provided with any further information detailing the substantive changes that had been made. Therefore they were unable to determine whether the changes to the learning outcomes continue to allow those students who successfully complete the programme to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the standards of proficiency continue to be delivered through the learning outcomes of the programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence which demonstrates how the learning outcomes continue to ensure that graduates meet the standards of proficiency.

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 standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document directed visitors to a list of module amendments in Appendix 15. From their review of this the visitors noted numerous changes that had been made since September 2013, including amendments to learning outcomes and assessments and a new optional level 6 module. As part of the evidence submitted the visitors were not provided with any further information detailing the substantive changes that had been made. Therefore they were unable to determine whether the changes to the assessments continued to ensure that those students who successfully complete the programme to meet the learning outcomes, and therefore the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers, in England. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the standards of proficiency continue to be assessed.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence which demonstrate how the assessments continue to ensure that the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency are met by graduates of the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted, in Appendix 15, changes to the learning outcomes and assessments which would apply from the academic year 2015–16. As this annual monitoring audit reviewed the academic years 2012–13 and 2013–14, they did not review these changes. The visitors would therefore recommend to the education provider that they consider informing the HCPC of these changes 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	3
Section five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme title	MA Social Work (Chelmsford)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gerry Mulcahy (Social worker in England) Donald Wetherick (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - CVs
 - Student course handbook
 - Practice placement guide and workbook
 - Quality assurance in practice learning

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to 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 standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document directed visitors to a list of module amendments in Appendix 15. From their review of this the visitors noted numerous changes that had been made since September 2013, including amendments to learning outcomes and assessments and a new optional level 6 module. As part of the evidence submitted the visitors were not provided with any further information detailing the substantive changes that had been made. Therefore they were unable to determine whether the changes to the learning outcomes continue to allow those students who successfully complete the programme to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the standards of proficiency continue to be delivered through the learning outcomes of the programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence which demonstrates how the learning outcomes continue to ensure that graduates meet the standards of proficiency.

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 standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document directed visitors to a list of module amendments in Appendix 15. From their review of this the visitors noted numerous changes that had been made since September 2013, including amendments to learning outcomes and assessments and a new optional level 6 module. As part of the evidence submitted the visitors were not provided with any further information detailing the substantive changes that had been made. Therefore they were unable to determine whether the changes to the assessments continued to ensure that those students who successfully complete the programme to meet the learning outcomes, and therefore the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers, in England. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the standards of proficiency continue to be assessed.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence which demonstrate how the assessments continue to ensure that the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency are met by graduates of the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted, in Appendix 15, changes to the learning outcomes and assessments which would apply from the academic year 2015–16. As this annual monitoring audit reviewed the academic years 2012–13 and 2013–14, they did not review these changes. The visitors would therefore recommend to the education provider that they consider informing the HCPC of these changes 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	Bangor University
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin.Psy)
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) James McManus (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	11 May 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Service user 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	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Bradford College
Name of validating body	Teesside University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gerry Mulcahy (Social worker in England) Donald Wetherick (Music therapist)
HCPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted, in the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document, the introduction of a group work exercise as part of the admissions procedures. The visitors were provided with a web link to the course overview for the programme but could find no mention of this. As such they were unsure how applicants were made aware that their interpersonal and group work skills would be assessed through this activity as part of the admissions procedure. Therefore the visitors require further evidence as to how the programme team ensure that applicants to the programme continue to have all the information they require to make an informed decision to apply to the programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to what information applicants receive to ensure they are fully aware of the admissions procedure for the programme.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that it was the education provider's policy to have two external examiners report on the programme each year. From the evidence provided the visitors were clear that one external examiner was in place across 2013–14 and 2014–15 as their reports and the education provider's response were included in the audit documentation. However, it was clear that the second examiner changed in 2014–15 as there was only one report and response included in this audit submission. In the Course Level Report for Annual Review Year 2013/14 a number of observations were outlined from the previous external examiner but the visitors did not receive a copy of their report or the education provider's letter of response. As such the visitors are unclear as to what the external examiner noted as part of their role and how the response of the education provider addressed all of the areas that were highlighted by the external examiner. The visitors were therefore are unclear as to how the programme team have maintained the regular monitoring and evaluation system for this programme between 2013 and 2015. Therefore the visitors require further information to be submitted to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: External examiner report and response for 2013–14.

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

Reason: The visitors learnt that the programme had moved to the new David Hockney building. The visitors received a statement about the new resources but no further information demonstrating how the learning resources available were being used effectively by students. In the Annual Monitoring Report Review Year 2014/15 the visitors noted student feedback about the use of open learning zones and the climate control of the new building. The visitors therefore require further information demonstrating how the student feedback has been taken account of regarding the resources available to students and how the resources are being used effectively.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence of the how the new resources are being effectively used.

3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: The visitors learnt that the programme had moved to the new David Hockney building. They received a statement about the new resources but no further information demonstrating how the learning resources were appropriate and how they were being effectively used to support the learning and teaching activities of the programme. In the Annual Monitoring Report Review Year 2014/15 the visitors noted student feedback about the use of open learning zones and the climate control of the new building. The visitors therefore require further information demonstrating that the resources effectively support the required learning and teaching activities.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence of the resources available to effectively support the learning and teaching activities.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the Annual Monitoring Report Review Year 2014/15 that there has been a reduction in the number of placement days. While the visitors recognise that these changes have been driven as a result of funding from the Department of Health, they were unclear about how many placement days were now incorporated into the programme. As such, they were unable to determine whether the length, and possibly range, of placements continued to be appropriate to the delivery of the programme and achievement of the learning outcomes. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate this.

Suggested documentation: Information which demonstrates how the number of placement days appropriately supports the delivery of the programme and achievement of the learning outcomes.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Cardiff University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pamela Bagley (Physiotherapist) Elaine McCurrach (Prosthetist / orthotist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Document 1 Physiotherapy BSc Hons Minor Change HC1117
 - Document 2 Physiotherapy BSc Hons Minor Change HC1120
 - Document 3 Physiotherapy BSc Hons Minor Change HC2128
 - Document 4 Physiotherapy ARE 1
 - Document 5 Physiotherapy ARE 2
 - Document 6 Physiotherapy BSc Hons CSP AQR a
 - Document 7 BSc Hons CSP AQR b
 - Document 8 BSc Hons HCPC Validation

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were provided with statement to evidence the involvement of service users and carers for this programme. From the statement, the visitors noted that the involvement consisted of a range of service user video stories and input from service users and carers into the quality assurance of the programme. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the statement what the range of video stories consisted of and the degree of input from service users and carers into the programme. The visitors were also unclear as to how the programme team had determined the nature of involvement of the service users and carers, and that appropriate training had been offered to ensure the service users and carers could be supported in their involvement. As such the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors also require further evidence as to how the programme team train and prepare the service users and carers to ensure that they can fulfil the role they are being asked to undertake.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how service users and carers are chosen to be part of the programme, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare the service users and carers to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake where applicable.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	City University
Programme title	Independent and Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing Programme (V300)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Module Specification
 - Practice Based Assessment Portfolio
 - Designated Medical Practitioners, Module and Pre-course Handbooks
 - Timetable

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors were made aware that students on this programme interact with service users and carers when they are on placement and at the Shared decision-making and Patient experience session. However, the visitors could not determine how these service users were involved in the programme beyond this interaction. They were also unclear, from the evidence provided, how the programme team determine which people are the most appropriate service users to be involved in the programme and what training might be provided to ensure they can be appropriately involved. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team will involve service users and carers in the programme beyond the interaction with students. The visitors also require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine which service users and carers should be involved in the programme and why the involvement highlighted is appropriate.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how the programme team involve service users and carers in the programme, how they are chosen, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare them to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted in the module handbook, page 4, that the main educational aim for the programme was for students to meet the "HPC (2011)" standards. The visitors want to highlight that since 2012 the HPC has been called the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) and students now need to meet the standards for prescribers which came into effect in 2013. As such, this element of the module handbook is out of date and may provide students with misleading information about the requirements of statutory regulation. The visitors recommend that the programme team update the programme documentation to reflect that the education aim of the programme is to ensure that students can meet the HCPC's standards for prescribers that were introduced in 2013.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

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	City University
Programme title	Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
 - Internal quality report for one year ago
 - Internal quality report for two years ago
 - External examiner's report for one year ago
 - External examiner's report for two years ago
 - Response to external examiner's report one year ago
 - Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- Module Specification
 - Practice Based Assessment Portfolio
 - Designated Medical Practitioners, Module and Pre-course Handbooks
 - Timetable

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided the visitors were made aware that students on this programme interact with service users and carers when they are on placement and at the Shared Decision-making and Patient Experience session. However, the visitors could not determine how these service users were involved in the programme beyond this interaction. They were also unclear, from the evidence provided, how the programme team determine which people are the most appropriate service users to be involved in the programme and what training might be provided to ensure they can be appropriately involved. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team will involve service users and carers in the programme beyond the interaction with students. The visitors also require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine which service users and carers should be involved in the programme and why the involvement highlighted is appropriate.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how the programme team involve service users and carers in the programme, how they are chosen, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare them to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted in the module handbook, page 4, that the main educational aim for the programme was for students to meet the "HPC (2011)" standards. The visitors want to highlight that since 2012 the HPC has been called the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) and students now need to meet the standards for prescribers which came into effect in 2013. As such, this element of the module handbook is out of date and may provide students with misleading information about the requirements of statutory regulation. The visitors recommend that the programme team update the programme documentation to reflect that the education aim of the programme is to ensure that students can meet the HCPC's standards for prescribers that were introduced in 2013.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

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 Dundee
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 11)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- Module assessment reports
- University of Dundee assessment policy
- University of Dundee self-report letter

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors were made aware that students on this programme interact with service users and carers when they are assessed through objective structured clinical examinations (OSCE) and at other points on placement. However, the visitors could not determine how these service users were involved in the programme beyond this interaction. They were also unclear, from the evidence provided, how the programme team determine which people are the most appropriate service users to be involved in the programme and what training might be provided to ensure they can be appropriately involved. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team will involve service users and carers in the programme beyond the interaction with students. The visitors also require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine which service users and carers should be involved in the programme and why the involvement highlighted is appropriate.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how the programme team involve service users and carers in the programme, how they are chosen, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare them to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Section three: Additional documentation	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Dundee
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 9)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- Module assessment reports
- University of Dundee assessment policy
- University of Dundee self-report letter

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors were made aware that students on this programme interact with service users and carers when they are assessed through objective structured clinical examinations (OSCE) and at other points on placement. However, the visitors could not determine how these service users were involved in the programme beyond this interaction. They were also unclear, from the evidence provided, how the programme team determine which people are the most appropriate service users to be involved in the programme and what training might be provided to ensure they can be appropriately involved. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team will involve service users and carers in the programme beyond the interaction with students. The visitors also require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine which service users and carers should be involved in the programme and why the involvement highlighted is appropriate.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how the programme team involve service users and carers in the programme, how they are chosen, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare them to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Dundee
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 11)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Module assessment reports
 - University of Dundee assessment policy
 - University of Dundee self-report letter

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors were made aware that students on this programme interact with service users and carers when they are assessed through objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs) and at other points on placement. However, the visitors could not determine how these service users were involved in the programme beyond this interaction. They were also unclear, from the evidence provided, how the programme team determine which people are the most appropriate service users to be involved in the programme and what training might be provided to ensure they can be appropriately involved. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team will involve service users and carers in the programme beyond the interaction with students. The visitors also require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine which service users and carers should be involved in the programme and why the involvement highlighted is appropriate.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how the programme team involve service users and carers in the programme, how they are chosen, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare them to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Dundee
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 9)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Module assessment reports
 - University of Dundee assessment policy
 - University of Dundee self-report letter

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors were made aware that students on this programme interact with service users and carers when they are assessed through objective structured clinical examinations (OSCE) and at other points on placement. However, the visitors could not determine how these service users were involved in the programme beyond this interaction. They were also unclear, from the evidence provided, how the programme team determine which people are the most appropriate service users to be involved in the programme and what training might be provided to ensure they can be appropriately involved. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team will involve service users and carers in the programme beyond the interaction with students. The visitors also require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine which service users and carers should be involved in the programme and why the involvement highlighted is appropriate.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how the programme team involve service users and carers in the programme, how they are chosen, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare them to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	5
Section five: Visitors' comments	5

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Edinburgh
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
Mode of delivery	Full time Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) Lynn Dunwoody (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's 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
 - Minutes of Advisory Panel of Experts by Experience (APEX) meetings for 2014-16
 - Guidance on creating distance participation sessions

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to 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 internal reports for this programme mentioned dissatisfaction in a number of areas such as teaching rooms, office space and student study and social space. However, the visitors were unable to see what action had been taken as a result of the comments within the internal monitoring reports. Specifically the visitors were unable to see how the education provider includes key stakeholders such as students and trainee supervisors in the feedback loop to ensure their concerns are addressed. Consequently, the visitors could not be satisfied that the current monitoring and evaluation systems are appropriate and effective. The visitors therefore require evidence which demonstrates how the education provider acts upon feedback from students and trainee supervisors and how the feedback loop is closed in relation to this. This way the visitors can ensure there continues to be effective monitoring and evaluation for the programme and how the feedback loop is closed between the education provider, supervisors and students.

Suggested documentation: Evidence which demonstrates effective monitoring and evaluation systems are in place, such as meeting minutes and examples of how they close the feedback loops between the education provider, students and trainee supervisors.

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

Reason: From the internal validation reports the visitors noted comments regarding dissatisfaction with the communication and liaison between the education provider, students and practice educators and contrasting reviews on whether this had improved over recent years. The visitors noted that without seeing how that the education providers is effectively acting on feedback from all parties involved in the placement process they cannot be certain that the education provider has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place in relation to practice placements. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how the education provider is addressing the concerns around placement communication and any action taken as a result of this to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Additional documentation: Evidence which demonstrates regular monitoring and evaluation systems are in place for the placement setting such as placement meeting minutes and actions plans.

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

Reason: The visitors noted the programme's dependence on technology and IT support resources, particularly in distance and blended learning, to support this programme. However, the internal quality reports provided as part of this submission make reference to the video conferencing facilities being 'suboptimal' and consideration being made for its continued use on the programme. The reports also mention students' dissatisfaction with the limitations of video conferencing and teaching rooms on the programme. The visitors note that these same issues were raised in the annual monitoring audit for this programme in 2014 and are therefore concerned that action that was committed to by the education provider in their response to the audit in 2014 was not implemented, or not effective. The visitors therefore require evidence which demonstrates how this programme ensures that the resources to support student learning in all settings is effectively used. Specifically, how the programme intends to support videoconferencing facilities and ensure teaching rooms are adequate.

Supporting documentation: Evidence which demonstrates that the facilities to support student learning on this programme are effectively. Evidence such as reassurance that video conferencing facilities are effectively working and information on any actions taken in response to the issues identified for technology resources and teaching rooms.

3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: With reference to the reason under SET 3.8 of this report the visitors are unable to see how the resources to support student learning effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of this programme. In addition, the visitors note that there were concerns raised in the internal monitoring reports regarding the adequacy of office space for staff and study and social space for students. The visitors note that both office space and study and social space are key to ensuring that the required teaching and learning activities of the programme are adequately supported. The visitors therefore require evidence which demonstrates how this programme ensures that the resources to support student learning effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. Specifically, how the programme intends to support videoconferencing facilities and ensure that teaching rooms, office space, and student study and social space is adequate.

Supporting documentation: Evidence which demonstrates that the facilities to support student learning effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of this programme. Evidence such as reassurance that video conferencing facilities are effectively working and information on any actions taken in response to the issues identified for technology resources, teaching rooms, office space and student study and social space.

3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Reason: With reference to the reason under SETs 3.8 and 3.9 of this report the visitors were unable to see how the learning resources are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students and staff. The visitors therefore require evidence which demonstrates how this programme ensures that the learning resources are appropriate to

the curriculum and are readily available to students and staff. Specifically, how the programme intends to support videoconferencing facilities and ensure that teaching rooms, office space, and student study and social space is adequate. Specifically, how the programme intends to support and make available videoconferencing facilities and ensure that teaching rooms, office space, and student study and social space is adequate and readily available.

Supporting documentation: Evidence which demonstrates that the learning resources are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students and staff. Evidence such as reassurance that video conferencing facilities are effectively working and information on any actions taken in response to the issues identified for technology resources, teaching rooms, office space and student study and social space.

5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Reason: From the internal validation reports the visitors noted comments regarding dissatisfaction with the communication between the education provider and practice educators and contrasting reviews on whether this had improved over recent years. The visitors note that without seeing how that the education provider is effectively acting on feedback from all parties involved in the placement process they cannot be certain that there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how the education provider is addressing the concerns around placement communication and any action taken as a result of this to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Additional documentation: Evidence which demonstrates regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider such as placement meeting minutes and actions plans.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of 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 note that the external examiner report for 2014 – 15 suggests that some staff have an overload of work with relation to the dissertation module. Whilst this annual monitoring audit does not cover any period beyond the 2014 – 15 academic year they wish to advise the education provider that they will need to demonstrate how this area has been addressed in their next annual monitoring audit.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Lincoln Simmonds (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of postal review	12 May 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Cover letter
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Academic committee minutes
 - Practice placement allocations
 - Programme module structure

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards 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 Essex
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (pre registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pamela Bagley (Physiotherapist) Elaine McCurrach (Prosthetist / orthotist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

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

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were provided with documentation to evidence the involvement of service users and carers for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme, they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of 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 Essex
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pamela Bagley (Physiotherapist) Elaine McCurrach (Prosthetist / orthotist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

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

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were provided with documentation to evidence the involvement of service users and carers for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme, they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) 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	Beverley Ball (Therapeutic radiographer) Gail Fairey (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's 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 admissions policy
 - Staff and student committee 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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided the visitors are unclear that service users and carers are involved, in the programme. In the mapping document the visitors were referred to the reapproval document, however this document was not provided as part of this submission. The visitors were able to review this document from documentation previously submitted to the HCPC, but the visitors were still unclear about the roles of service users and carers on the programme. The visitors were also unclear as to how the programme team had determined the nature of involvement of the service users and carers, and that appropriate training had been offered to ensure the service users and carers could be involved in the programme. As such the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors also require further evidence as to how the programme team train and prepare the service users and carers to ensure that they can fulfil the role they are being asked to undertake.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how service users and carers are chosen to be part of the programme, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare the service users and carers to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake where applicable.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Tony Parnell (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Nutrition and dietetics generic approved programme document June 2015
 - Extract from nutrition and dietetics confirmed report March 2015
 - Programme team response to review of nutrition and dietetics programmes
 - MMB420670 previous placement A module descriptor
 - MMB423944 ammended placement A module descriptor

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme

Reason: The visitors were provided with documentation which highlighted a number of areas where service users and carers are involved on this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme title	MSc Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Tony Parnell (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- Nutrition and dietetics generic approved programme document June 2015
- Extract from nutrition and dietetics confirmed report March 2015
- Programme team response to review of nutrition and dietetics programmes
- MMB420670 previous placement A module descriptor
- MMB423944 ammended placement A module descriptor

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme

Reason: The visitors were provided with documentation which highlighted a number of areas where service users and carers are involved on this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme title	Pg Dip Dietetics (Pre-Registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Tony Parnell (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Nutrition and dietetics generic approved programme document June 2015
 - Extract from nutrition and dietetics confirmed report March 2015
 - Programme team response to review of nutrition and dietetics programmes
 - MMB420670 previous placement A module descriptor
 - MMB423944 ammended placement A module descriptor

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme

Reason: The visitors were provided with documentation which highlighted a number of areas where service users and carers are involved on this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of 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	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme title	Local Analgesia with Nail Surgery for Podiatrists
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Local anaesthetic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gemma Quinn (Independent prescriber) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

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

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: The visitors did not receive any of the required audit documentation to review. The visitors noted that the education provider has stated in a letter to the HCPC that the programme has not run for the duration of this audit period. In order for the visitors to be assured that this programme is effectively managed evidence is required to indicate how the programme has been managed during this period of time when no students have been on the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that the programme is effectively managed.

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

Reason: The visitors did not receive any of the required audit documentation to review. The visitors noted that the education provider has stated in a letter to the HCPC that the programme has not run for the duration of this audit period. In order for the visitors to be assured that this programme has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place, evidence is required to indicate how the programme has been monitored and evaluated during this period of time when no students have been on the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that the programme has monitoring and evaluation systems in place to meet this standard.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were referred via the audit mapping document to the email from the programme leader. This email did not provide any evidence and therefore the visitors could not determine if this standard was met. The visitors require evidence that clearly demonstrates that this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly evidences that service users and carers are involved in the programme.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Reason: The visitors did not receive any of the required audit documentation to review. The visitors noted that the education provider has stated in a letter to the HCPC that the programme has not run for the duration of this audit period. In order for the visitors to be assured that this programme's curriculum remains relevant to current practice, evidence is required to indicate how the curriculum for the programme is kept up to date.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that the programme remains relevant to current practice.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors were content with the additional evidence provided by the education provider and have recommended reconfirming approval for the programme. The visitors would like to remind the education to consider sending the evidence sent as additional documentation, with the audit form for the next annual monitoring audit, to ensure that the audit can be reviewed 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	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Natalie Matchett (Occupational therapist) Robert Stratford (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Curriculum vitae of programme staff
 - Service User/Carer Involvement table

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided the visitors are clear that during the 2012-13 and 2013-14 academic years there were external examiners in place and they provided reports on the programme. These were responded to by the programme team and formed a key part of the regular monitoring and evaluation systems of the programme. However, the visitors could not find, in the evidence provided, any external examiner reports for the 2014-15 academic year or any responses to those reports. As such the visitors are unclear as to how the programme is continuing to have regular monitoring and evaluation undertaken by external examiners. Therefore the visitors require further information about the external examiners' involvement in the regular monitoring and evaluation of the programme in the 2014-15 academic year and how this will continue in subsequent years.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how external examiners were involved in the regular monitoring and evaluation of the programme in the 2014-15 academic year and how they will continue to be involved in the future. This could include the external examiners report for the 2014-15 academic year and the programme team's response to this.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided the visitors are clear that service users and carers are involved in elements of the programme and that there is a feedback mechanism to gather the opinions of those service users that have been involved. However, the visitors could not determine, from the evidence provided, how the service user and carers were determined by the programme team to be the most appropriate service users to be involved. The visitors were also unclear as to how the involvement of service users and carers highlighted was appropriate for those people selected and how the education provider prepares those people to be involved. As such the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine which service users and carers should be involved in the programme and how they help prepare those service users and carers to fulfil the role they are being asked to undertake.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how service users and carers are chosen to be part of the programme and how the team prepare the service users and carers to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Natalie Matchett (Occupational therapist) Robert Stratford (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Service User/Carer Involvement table
 - Curriculum vitae of programme 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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided the visitors are clear that service users and carers are involved in elements of the programme and that there is a feedback mechanism to gather the opinions of those service users that have been involved. However, the visitors could not determine, from the evidence provided, how the service user and carers were determined by the programme team to be the most appropriate service users to be involved. The visitors were also unclear as to how the involvement of service users and carers highlighted was appropriate for those people selected and what training had been offered to ensure the service users and careers could undertake the roles they were being asked to fulfil. As such the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine which service users and carers should be involved in the programme and why the involvement highlighted is appropriate. The visitors also require further evidence as to how the programme team train and prepare the service users and carers to ensure that they can fulfil the role they are being asked to undertake.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how service users and carers are chosen to be part of the programme, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare the service users and carers to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of 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 Glasgow
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Lincoln Simmonds (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	10 May 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's 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 were no responses provided to the external examiners reports as there were no significant comments that required a formal response. Where the external examiner made a suggestion for the timing of the examination board this was agreed with the quality assurance office.

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Leeds Beckett University
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professions
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Andrew Hill (Chropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	3 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- Faculty of Health and Social Sciences Inter-Professional Learning (IPL) update and review of the faculty provision 2013/14
- 2014/15 Service User and Carer Faculty Strategy Group Annual Report
- Service Users and Carers guidance for the Inter-professional learning 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.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the Faculty Annual Reports for 2013—14 and 2014—15, from this evidence the visitors couldn't not determine that the programme had regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place. The visitors noted that the 2013—14 report made no reference to the programme under review. In addition the 2014—15 the report stated "The HCPC approved the addition of Independent Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals to the Non-Medical Prescribing module and a major change to the BA (Hons) Social Work provision in relation to recruitment numbers." The visitors note that this was the only reference made to the programme in the reports and could not determine that there are regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place. Therefore the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate that there are regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Additional documentation: Evidence that the programme has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place, such as minutes from review meetings for the programme which could also include student feedback.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Leeds Beckett University
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professions
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Andrew Hill (Chropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	3 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- Faculty of Health and Social Sciences Inter-Professional Learning (IPL) update and review of the faculty provision 2013/14
- 2014/15 Service User and Carer Faculty Strategy Group Annual Report
- Service Users and Carers guidance for the Inter-professional learning 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.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the Faculty Annual Reports for 2013—14 and 2014—15, from this evidence the visitors couldn't not determine that the programme had regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place. The visitors noted that the 2013—14 report made no reference to the programme under review. In addition the 2014—15 the report stated "The HCPC approved the addition of Independent Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals to the Non-Medical Prescribing module and a major change to the BA (Hons) Social Work provision in relation to recruitment numbers." The visitors note that this was the only reference made to the programme in the reports and could not determine that there are regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place. Therefore the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate that there are regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Additional documentation: Evidence that the programme has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place, such as minutes from review meetings for the programme which could also include student feedback.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Edinburgh Napier University
Programme title	AHP SP – IP Conversion course
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's 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 responses to the external examiner's report for one year ago and two years ago were not included as part of the documentation as there were no responses and actions needed in response to the external examiner's reports.

- Amended programme specification
- Curriculum vitae for Robin Hyde and Austin Snowden

- Portfolio documentation
- List of recent publications

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors were made aware that students on this programme interact with service users and carers when they are on placement. However, the visitors could not determine how these service users were involved in the programme beyond this interaction. They were also unclear, from the evidence provided, how the programme team determine which people are the most appropriate service users to be involved in the programme and what training might be provided to ensure they can be appropriately involved. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team will involve service users and carers in the programme beyond the interaction with students. The visitors also require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine which service users and carers should be involved in the programme and why the involvement highlighted is appropriate.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how the programme team involve service users and carers in the programme, how they are chosen, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare them to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

After a review of the additional documentation submitted by the educational provider, the visitors agree that there is sufficient evidence to show how the programme meets B.15 from the standards for prescribing at threshold. However, the visitors recommend that the education provider develops further the involvement of service users and carers in the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Edinburgh Napier University
Programme title	Radiographer Supplementary Prescriber
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's 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 responses to the external examiner's report for one year ago and two years ago were not included as part of the documentation as there were no responses and actions needed in response to the external examiner's reports.

- Amended programme specification
- Curriculum vitae for Robin Hyde and Austin Snowden
- Portfolio documentation

- List of recent publications

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors were made aware that students on this programme interact with service users and carers when they are on placement. However, the visitors could not determine how these service users were involved in the programme beyond this interaction. They were also unclear, from the evidence provided, how the programme team determine which people are the most appropriate service users to be involved in the programme and what training might be provided to ensure they can be appropriately involved. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team will involve service users and carers in the programme beyond the interaction with students. The visitors also require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine which service users and carers should be involved in the programme and why the involvement highlighted is appropriate.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how the programme team involve service users and carers in the programme, how they are chosen, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare them to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

After a review of the additional documentation submitted by the educational provider, the visitors agree that there is sufficient evidence to show how the programme meets B.15 from the standards for prescribing at threshold. However, the visitors recommend that the education provider develops further the involvement of service users and carers in the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Edinburgh Napier University
Programme title	Non Medical Prescribing for Nurses, Midwives and Allied Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's 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 responses to the external examiner's report for one year ago and two years ago were not included as part of the documentation as there were no responses and actions needed in response to the external examiner's reports.

- Amended programme specification

- Curriculum vitae for Robin Hyde and Austin Snowden
- Portfolio documentation
- List of recent publications

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors were made aware that students on this programme interact with service users and carers when they are on placement. However, the visitors could not determine how these service users were involved in the programme beyond this interaction. They were also unclear, from the evidence provided, how the programme team determine which people are the most appropriate service users to be involved in the programme and what training might be provided to ensure they can be appropriately involved. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team will involve service users and carers in the programme beyond the interaction with students. The visitors also require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine which service users and carers should be involved in the programme and why the involvement highlighted is appropriate.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how the programme team involve service users and carers in the programme, how they are chosen, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare them to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

After a review of the additional documentation submitted by the educational provider, the visitors agree that there is sufficient evidence to show how the programme meets B.15 from the standards for prescribing at threshold. However, the visitors recommend that the education provider develops further the involvement of service users and carers in the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gemma Quinn (Independent prescriber) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - BSc Hons Podiatry validation report and response,
 - Subsequent module changes approved by School Academic Board
 - The service user involvement strategy

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided the visitors are clear that service users and carers have been involved in delivering some content in the Communication and facilitating change module. However, the visitors could not determine how these service users were determined by the programme team to be the most appropriate service users to be involved. They were also unclear as to how the programme team had determined that the involvement highlighted was appropriate for these service users and carers and that appropriate training had been offered to ensure they could undertake the roles they were being asked to fulfil. As such the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine which service users and carers should be involved in the programme and why the involvement highlighted is appropriate. The visitors also require further evidence as to how the programme team train and prepare the service users and carers to ensure that they can fulfil the role they are being asked to undertake.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how service users and carers are chosen to be part of the programme, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare the service users and carers to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake where applicable.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of 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 received the documentation regarding the service user and carer involvement in the programme. Whilst the visitors are content that the standard is met the visitors suggest that the education provider keeps the role of the service user and carer under review and consider the planning of the service users and carers within the programme and how these roles can be developed as the role of the service users and carers within the programme progresses.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	Local Anaesthesia for HCPC registered podiatrists
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant entitlement	Local anaesthetic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gemma Quinn (Independent prescriber) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

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

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: The visitors did not receive any of the required audit documentation to review. The visitors noted that the education provider has stated in a letter to the HCPC that the programme has not run for the duration of this audit period. In order for the visitors to be assured that this programme is effectively managed evidence is required to indicate how the programme has been managed during this period of time when no students have been on the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that the programme is effectively managed.

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

Reason: The visitors did not receive any of the required audit documentation to review. The visitors noted that the education provider has stated in a letter to the HCPC that the programme has not run for the duration of this audit period. In order for the visitors to be assured that this programme has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place, evidence is required to indicate how the programme has been monitored and evaluated during this period of time when no students have been on the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that the programme has monitoring and evaluation systems in place to meet this standard.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme

Reason: The visitors did not receive any of the required audit documentation to review. The visitors noted that the education provider has stated in a letter to the HCPC that the programme has not run for the duration of this audit period. The audit mapping document said that the students are registered practitioners and therefore have patients and that the School of Health Sciences is developing a service user group. However no other evidence was offered. The visitors were therefore unable to determine if this standard was met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that the programme has service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Reason: The visitors did not receive any of the required audit documentation to review. The visitors noted that the education provider has stated in a letter to the HCPC that the programme has not run for the duration of this audit period. In order for the visitors to be

assured that this programme's curriculum remains relevant to current practice, evidence is required to indicate how the curriculum for the programme is kept up to date.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that the programme remains relevant to current practice.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of 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	Surrey and South East London partnership with Royal Holloway, University of London
Name of validating	Royal Holloway, University of London
Programme title	Step-up Post-Graduate Diploma in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Graham Noyce (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of postal review	3 May 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Practice educator support
 - Tutor materials
 - Service user and carer materials
 - Procurement document
 - November 2015 student on-boarding
 - Mapping document

- Step Up/PG Diploma schedule
- Registry confirmation
- Curriculum Development Group record
- Assessment centre materials
- Student handbook
- Integrative seminar and readiness module outlines
- Draft syllabus
- Practice Assessment Panel minutes cohort 3
- Steering board minutes
- Module evaluation document
- Insight 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	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of postal review	29 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Admissions report service users 2015-16
 - Minutes 12 December 2014 from meeting with service users
 - Minutes 22 January 2016 from the Physio Service User Advisory Group
 - Presentation - reward and recognition - draft 1
 - Service user Group PowerPoint
 - Service user feedback regarding information about work with schools and colleges
 - 66-5678-00S Physiotherapy Practice Module Descriptor
 - Physiotherapy BSc (Hons) Course Document
 - Course Prospectus

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards 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	Sheffield Hallam 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	Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner) Nick Clark (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	17 May 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
 - Internal quality report for one year ago
 - Internal quality report for two years ago
 - External examiner's report for one year ago
 - External examiner's 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
 - Service user report
 - Service User and Engagement strategy Framework December 2014 document
 - Faculty Engagement update ODP Dip HE 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	Southampton Solvent University
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	David Childs (Social worker in England) Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of postal review	12 May 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's 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
 - Admissions pack
 - Briefing pack
 - Practice handbook 2016-17
 - School organisation chart
 - Staff profiles
 - New performance and development review scheme

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Strathclyde
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Prosthetics / orthotics
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elaine McCurrach (Prosthetics / orthotics) Pamela Bagley (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that from January 2015 that the named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme has changed from Elaine Figgins to David Bowers. However, the visitors were not provided with any evidence to determine if whether the new programme leader is appropriately qualified, experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register. As such, the visitors require further evidence.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence on the named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme and in particular their appropriately qualification, experience and registration, unless other arrangements are agreed.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were provided with documentation to evidence the involvement of service users and carers for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme, they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pamela Bagley (Physiotherapist) Elaine McCurrach (Prosthetist / orthotist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

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

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were provided with documentation to evidence the involvement of service users and carers for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme, they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pamela Bagley (Physiotherapist) Elaine McCurrach (Prosthetist / orthotist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

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

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were provided with documentation to evidence the involvement of service users and carers for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme, they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme title	Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pamela Bagley (Physiotherapist) Elaine McCurrach (Prosthetist / orthotist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

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

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were provided with documentation to evidence the involvement of service users and carers for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme, they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of postal review	1 March 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's 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
 - Support charter for student support
 - Carecall leaflet
 - Attendance policy
 - Screen shots of webpages
 - Correspondence regarding service user involvement
 - Email correspondence and workbook of collaborative development of teaching materials
 - Module descriptors

- University learning and teaching strategy 2013-14 to 2017-18
- Correspondence to students
- Information on interprofessional learning activities
- Correspondence from practice educators
- Correspondence regarding new commissioned training
- Curriculum vitae for the 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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were provided with documentation to evidence the involvement of service users and carers for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme, they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	MSc Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment postal review	1 March 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's 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
 - Support charter for student support
 - Carecall leaflet
 - Screen shots of webpages
 - Correspondence regarding service user involvement
 - Email correspondence and workbook of collaborative development of teaching materials
 - Module descriptors
 - University learning and teaching strategy 2013-14 to 2017-18

- Correspondence to students
- Correspondence from practice educators
- Correspondence regarding new commissioned training
- Curriculum vitae for the 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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were provided with documentation to evidence the involvement of service users and carers for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme, they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	Pg Dip Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of postal review	1 March 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's 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
 - Support charter for student support
 - Carecall leaflet
 - Screen shots of webpages
 - Correspondence regarding service user involvement
 - Email correspondence and workbook of collaborative development of teaching materials
 - Module descriptors
 - University learning and teaching strategy 2013-14 to 2017-18

- Correspondence to students
- Correspondence from practice educators
- Correspondence regarding new commissioned training
- Curriculum vitae for the 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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were provided with documentation to evidence the involvement of service users and carers for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme, they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Royal Holloway, University of London
Programme title	MSc in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gerry Mulcahy (Social worker in England) Donald Wetherick (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Minutes of programme team and service user group meetings
 - Admissions procedures
 - Service user and carer 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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the Minutes of Social Work Course Board on 30 March 2015 there had been a change to the second year timetable so students complete two days in university and three days on placement. This has allowed a new module 'Critical Reflection to teaching' to be included in the timetable. However the visitors were unclear, from the evidence provided, how these changes would affect modules across the year, in particular the available teaching time and when and how learning outcomes would be delivered. As such the visitors could not determine how this change has been managed by the programme team to ensure that the learning outcomes continue to make sure that those who successfully complete the programme can meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England. Therefore to ensure the learning outcomes for the programme continue to allow a student to achieve the SOPs, the visitors require further information.

Suggested documentation: Documentation showing how the standards of proficiency continue to be met.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the Minutes of Social Work Course Board on 30 March 2015 that there has been a change to the second year timetable so students complete two days in university and three days on placement. This allowed for the inclusion of a new module on 'Critical Reflection to teaching'. However the visitors were unclear, from the evidence provided, whether there had been an increase or decrease in the number of placement days. As such the visitors could not determine how the programme team had managed this change to ensure that the number, duration and range of practice placements continues to support the achievement of the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate this.

Suggested documentation: Information which demonstrates how the number of placement days has changed. There should also be evidence provided which demonstrates how this change continues to support the delivery of the programme and achievement of the learning outcomes.

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 in the Minutes of Social Work Course Board on 30 March 2015 there had been a change to the second year timetable so students complete two days in university and three days on placement. This has allowed a new module on 'Critical Reflection to teaching' to be included in the timetable. However the visitors were unclear, from the evidence provided, how these changes would affect modules across the year, in particular when and how learning outcomes would be delivered and assessed and therefore how the achievement of the SOPs would be gauged. As such the visitors could not determine how this change has been managed by the programme team to ensure that the assessment of the learning outcomes continue to make sure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the relevant SOPs. To ensure the assessment strategy continues to allow a student to achieve the SOPs, the visitors require further information.

Suggested documentation: Documentation showing how the assessment strategy continues to ensure that the standards of proficiency for social workers in England are met by those students who successfully complete the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Royal Holloway, University of London
Programme title	PG Dip in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gerry Mulcahy (Social worker in England) Donald Wetherick (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Minutes of programme team and service user group meetings
 - Admissions procedures
 - Service user and carer 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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the Minutes of Social Work Course Board on 30 March 2015 there had been a change to the second year timetable so students complete two days in university and three days on placement. This has allowed a new module 'Critical Reflection to teaching' to be included in the timetable. However the visitors were unclear, from the evidence provided, how these changes would affect modules across the year, in particular the available teaching time and when and how learning outcomes would be delivered. As such the visitors could not determine how this change has been managed by the programme team to ensure that the learning outcomes continue to make sure that those who successfully complete the programme can meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England. Therefore to ensure the learning outcomes for the programme continue to allow a student to achieve the SOPs, the visitors require further information.

Suggested documentation: Documentation showing how the standards of proficiency continue to be met.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the Minutes of Social Work Course Board on 30 March 2015 that there has been a change to the second year timetable so students complete two days in university and three days on placement. This allowed for the inclusion of a new module on 'Critical Reflection to teaching'. However the visitors were unclear, from the evidence provided, whether there had been an increase or decrease in the number of placement days. As such the visitors could not determine how the programme team had managed this change to ensure that the number, duration and range of practice placements continues to support the achievement of the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate this.

Suggested documentation: Information which demonstrates how the number of placement days has changed. There should also be evidence provided which demonstrates how this change continues to support the delivery of the programme and achievement of the learning outcomes.

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 in the Minutes of Social Work Course Board on 30 March 2015 there had been a change to the second year timetable so students complete two days in university and three days on placement. This has allowed a new module on 'Critical Reflection to teaching' to be included in the timetable. However the visitors were unclear, from the evidence provided, how these changes would affect modules across the year, in particular when and how learning outcomes would be delivered and assessed and therefore how the achievement of the SOPs would be gauged. As such the visitors could not determine how this change has been managed by the programme team to ensure that the assessment of the learning outcomes continue to make sure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the relevant SOPs. To ensure the assessment strategy continues to allow a student to achieve the SOPs, the visitors require further information.

Suggested documentation: Documentation showing how the assessment strategy continues to ensure that the standards of proficiency for social workers in England are met by those students who successfully complete the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DcounsPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Counselling psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Tony Parnell (Counselling psychologist) Alison Nicholls (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Module and Award Board Meeting Minutes
 - Course Management Committee Meeting Minutes
 - Service User's Briefing and Structure
 - Example Module Report

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider directed the visitor to the 'Briefing for Role/Real-play Participants'. The visitors were satisfied that this document demonstrated where service users and carers would be involved in the programme and how they would be supported to deliver their role. However, the visitors were unable to identify who the education provider defined as their service users and carers and how they link with the documentation provided. Specifically, the evidence provided referred to a university wide service user and carer group 'SUCCESS' but did not define how this group engages with the role play activities identified and how members of this group were appropriate to act as service users and carers for this programme and profession. The visitors therefore require further documentation which clearly outlines who the education provider defines as their service users and carers and how they are appropriate and relevant to this programme and the profession of counselling psychology. In addition to this, evidence which clearly demonstrates how the SUCCESS group link with the role play activities highlighted for this programme.

Suggested documentation: Documentation which clearly outlines who the service users and carers are for this programme and how the SUCCESS group link with the role play activities for this programme. For example details of the relevant experience of the SUCCESS group members and their direct link to this programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of York
Programme title	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Steve Benson (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's 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 CVs
 - Module leads 2015/16
 - Service User and Carer Participation Advisory Group minutes – 5 January 2016
 - Service User and Carer Participation Advisory Group web page
 - National Student Survey (NSS) action plan

Section three: Additional documentation

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

6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Reason: The visitors noted the education provider's response to Paul Willis' external examiner report from 2014-15, specifically the comment "It would be helpful to hear more about the ways in which markers take into consideration identified learning difficulties." The response suggests that there are allowances for students with individual support plans so "problems with grammar, spelling and punctuation are not penalised" in marking of written assessments. The education provider also notes that "...social work students are on a professional programme where they need to be able to write clearly and intelligibly to different audiences...". The visitors consider that support mechanisms in place for students with learning needs are appropriate at the teaching and formative assessment stage. However, the visitors are unclear how this standard continues to be met if students are marked to different criteria at final assessment depending on their support needs. Therefore, the visitors require further information to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Information that demonstrates how the programme ensures written assessments are objective and ensure fitness to practise.

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

Reason: The visitors noted the education provider's response to Paul Willis' external examiner report from 2014-15, specifically the comment "It would be helpful to hear more about the ways in which markers take into consideration identified learning difficulties." The response suggests that there are allowances for students with individual support plans so "problems with grammar, spelling and punctuation are not penalised" in marking of written assessments. The education provider also notes that "...social work students are on a professional programme where they need to be able to write clearly and intelligibly to different audiences...". The visitors consider that support mechanisms in place for students with learning needs are appropriate at the teaching and formative assessment stage. However, the visitors are unclear how this standard continues to be met if students are marked to different criteria at final assessment depending on their support needs. Therefore, the visitors require further information to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Information that demonstrates how the programme ensures appropriate standards in the written assessment of students.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of York
Programme title	Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Steve Benson (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	13 April 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's 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 CVs
- Module leads 2015/16
- Service User and Carer Participation Advisory Group minutes – 5 January 2016
- Service User and Carer Participation Advisory Group web page
- National Student Survey (NSS) action plan

Section three: Additional documentation

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

6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Reason: The visitors noted the education provider's response to Paul Willis' external examiner report from 2014-15, specifically the comment "It would be helpful to hear more about the ways in which markers take into consideration identified learning difficulties." The response suggests that there are allowances for students with individual support plans so "problems with grammar, spelling and punctuation are not penalised" in marking of written assessments. The education provider also notes that "...social work students are on a professional programme where they need to be able to write clearly and intelligibly to different audiences...". The visitors consider that support mechanisms in place for students with learning needs are appropriate at the teaching and formative assessment stage. However, the visitors are unclear how this standard continues to be met if students are marked to different criteria at final assessment depending on their support needs. Therefore, the visitors require further information to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Information that demonstrates how the programme ensures written assessments are objective and ensure fitness to practise.

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

Reason: The visitors noted the education provider's response to Paul Willis' external examiner report from 2014-15, specifically the comment "It would be helpful to hear more about the ways in which markers take into consideration identified learning difficulties." The response suggests that there are allowances for students with individual support plans so "problems with grammar, spelling and punctuation are not penalised" in marking of written assessments. The education provider also notes that "...social work students are on a professional programme where they need to be able to write clearly and intelligibly to different audiences...". The visitors consider that support mechanisms in place for students with learning needs are appropriate at the teaching and formative assessment stage. However, the visitors are unclear how this standard continues to be met if students are marked to different criteria at final assessment depending on their support needs. Therefore, the visitors require further information to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Information that demonstrates how the programme ensures appropriate standards in the written assessment of students.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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