

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| Education provider         | Aston University                                      |
| Name of programme(s)       | BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, FT (Full time) |
| Date of initial assessment | 15 December 2017                                      |
| Case reference             | CAS-12297-N3R9Z2                                      |

### Contents

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....                    | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                          | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....        | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation .....                  | 3 |
| Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)..... | 3 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|                              |                      |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| Carol Ainley                 | Biomedical scientist |
| David Childs                 | Social worker        |
| Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah | HCPC executive       |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                       |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                        |
| Profession             | Biomedical scientist                  |
| First intake           | 01 October 2010                       |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25                              |
| Intakes per year       | 1                                     |
| Assessment reference   | AM07158                               |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation   | Submitted |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes       |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes       |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes       |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 18 January 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

### Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. The visitors noted in the internal quality report for the 2016-17 academic year that once learners are recruited onto the new BSc Biochemistry 2018-2019 academic year, there will be an impact on the availability of laboratories for learners on the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme. The education provider should consider submitting a major change notification form, if there is an impact on the resources available to learners on this programme.

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Education provider   | Cardiff University  |
| Name of programme(s) | Postgraduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing,<br>Cardiff University, Part time<br>Post Graduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing,<br>Cardiff University, Part time |
| Date of assessment   | 15 December 2017  |
| Case reference       | CAS-12310-V8M3F3  |

### Contents

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....                    | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                          | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....        | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation .....                  | 3 |
| Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)..... | 3 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 5 of this report.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|                   |                        |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Rosemary Furner   | Independent prescriber |
| Tristan Henderson | Paramedic              |
| Jamie Hunt        | HCPC executive         |
| Eloise O'Connell  | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Postgraduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)                                      |
| Entitlement            | Supplementary prescribing                           |
| First intake           | 01 September 2009                                   |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 35  |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07183   |

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | Post Graduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)                                       |
| Entitlement            | Independent prescribing                              |
| First intake           | 01 September 2015                                    |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 35   |
| Intakes per year       | 1  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07191  |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation  | Submitted |
|---|-----------|
| HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                          | Yes       |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                         | Yes       |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years            | Yes       |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 18 January 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

### Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

The visitors noted that the "HCPC Standard for prescribing 14.24" is referenced in the Mapping of professional regulatory body standards. This is an out of date reference to a

proficiency standard, which has now been replaced by the more detailed HCPC standards for prescribing. These programmes have previously demonstrated that they deliver these competency standards, in 2015 when the independent prescribing part of this programme was approved by the HCPC. Therefore the visitors were satisfied that the proficiency standards would continue to be delivered by the programme.

Additionally, the visitors noted references to the “HPC” in the Programme Document. Therefore, the visitors suggest that the programme updates the documentation to ensure it is reflective of current regulatory requirements.

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Education provider                | Cardiff University                                  |
| Name of programme(s)              | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time |
| Postal Date of initial assessment | 30 November 2017                                    |
| Case reference                    | CAS-12553-M3W3J4                                    |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation .....           | 3 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|               |                                   |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| Julie Weir    | Operating department practitioner |
| Tony Scripps  | Operating department practitioner |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive                    |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                           |
| Profession             | Operating department practitioner        |
| First intake           | 01 September 2014                        |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 60                                 |
| Intakes per year       | 1  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07185                                  |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation   | Submitted  |
|--|------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes<br>Yes |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes<br>Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes<br>Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes<br>Yes |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 18 January 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| Education provider         | Cardiff University   |
| Name of programme(s)       | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Cardiff University, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 15 December 2017   |
| Case reference             | CAS-12311-T0W9V1   |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation .....           | 3 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|               |                        |
|---------------|------------------------|
| Laura Graham  | Occupational therapist |
| Pamela Bagley | Physiotherapist        |
| Amal Hussein  | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                 |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                  |
| Profession             | Occupational therapist          |
| First intake           | 01 September 2007               |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 64                        |
| Intakes per year       | 1                               |
| Assessment reference   | AM07186                         |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| <b>Required documentation</b>  | <b>Submitted</b> |
|--|------------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes              |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes<br>Yes       |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes<br>Yes       |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes<br>Yes       |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 18 January 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| Education provider         | Cardiff University   |
| Name of programme(s)       | Pg Dip Occupational Therapy, Cardiff University, Full time accelerated |
| Date of initial assessment | 15 December 2017   |
| Case reference             | CAS-12286-J8F3V5   |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation .....           | 3 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|               |                        |
|---------------|------------------------|
| Laura Graham  | Occupational therapist |
| Pamela Bagley | Physiotherapist        |
| Amal Hussein  | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                             |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Programme name         | Pg Dip Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study          | FTA (Full time accelerated) |
| Profession             | Occupational therapist      |
| First intake           | 01 September 2007           |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25                    |
| Intakes per year       | 1                           |
| Assessment reference   | AM07187                     |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| <b>Required documentation</b>  | <b>Submitted</b> |
|--|------------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes              |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes<br>Yes       |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes<br>Yes       |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes<br>Yes       |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 11 January 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| Education provider         | Cardiff University                                      |
| Name of programme(s)       | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Cardiff University, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 15 December 2017  |
| Case reference             | CAS-12556-Y5D2L0  |

### Contents

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....                    | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                          | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....        | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation .....                  | 3 |
| Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)..... | 3 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|               |                        |
|---------------|------------------------|
| Laura Graham  | Occupational therapist |
| Pamela Bagley | Physiotherapist        |
| Amal Hussein  | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)           |
| Profession             | Physiotherapist          |
| First intake           | 01 September 2007        |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 120                |
| Intakes per year       | 1                        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07188                  |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation   | Submitted  |
|--|------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes        |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes<br>Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes<br>Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes<br>Yes |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 18 January 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

### Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

In the 'Annual Quality Proforma 2016/17', the visitors noted that the expected total number of places for academic year 2017/18 for this programme is 144. The visitors also noted in the 'Annual Review and Enhancement 2016/17', that the number of learner intake for September 2016 was 135. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that they have been approved for a maximum learners cohort of up to 120 with an intake per year of one. Changes to the number of learners on the programme must be reported via the major change process. Additionally, if the education provider recruits to the 144 then they must engage with the major change process, so that the visitors are able to make a judgement on whether the standards of education and training continue to be met given the increase of learners on the programme.

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Education provider   | The University of Northampton   |
| Name of programme(s) | Supplementary and Independent Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals, The University of Northampton, Part time |
| Date of assessment   | 15 December 2017  |
| Case reference       | CAS-12380-G1J4H2  |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation .....           | 3 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|                   |                        |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Rosemary Furner   | Independent prescriber |
| Tristan Henderson | Paramedic              |
| Eloise O'Connell  | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Supplementary and Independent Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)  |
| Entitlement            | Independent prescribing   |
| First intake           | 01 August 2016  |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10  |
| Intakes per year       | 2   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07348   |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation   | Submitted | Reason(s) for non-submission  |
|--|-----------|---|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |   |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | No        | There is not an internal quality report covering 2015-16 as programme has only been running since January 2017. We have received an internal quality report for 2016-17.  |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | No        | There is not an external examiner's report covering 2015-16 as the programme has only been running since January 2017. We have received an external examiner's report for 2016-17.                                  |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | No        | There is not a response to an external examiner's report covering 2015-16 as the programme has only been running since January 2017. We have received a response to an external examiner's report covering 2016-17. |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 18 January 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

# HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| Education provider         | Nottingham Trent University   |
| Name of programme(s)       | BA (Hons) Social Work, FT (Full time)<br>BA (Hons) Social Work, WBL (Work based learning) |
| Date of initial assessment | 15 December 2017  |
| Case reference             | CAS-12449-D2H9W9  |

**Contents**

Section 1: Our regulatory approach .....2

Section 2: Programme details.....2

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment .....3

Section 4 : Visitors’ recommendation .....3

**Executive Summary**

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|                              |                      |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| David Childs                 | Social worker        |
| Carol Ainley                 | Biomedical scientist |
| Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah | HCPC executive       |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name         | BA (Hons) Social Work    |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)           |
| Profession             | Social worker in England |
| First intake           | 01 August 2003           |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 17                 |
| Intakes per year       | 1                        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07349                  |

|                        |                           |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Programme name         | BA (Hons) Social Work     |
| Mode of study          | WBL (Work based learning) |
| Profession             | Social worker in England  |
| First intake           | 01 August 2003            |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 17                  |
| Intakes per year       | 1                         |
| Assessment reference   | AM07350                   |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation   | Submitted |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes       |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes       |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes       |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 18 January 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| Education provider         | Nottingham Trent University  |
| Name of programme(s)       | MA Social Work, FT (Full time)<br>MA Social Work, WBL (Work based learning)<br>PGDip in Social Work (Masters exit route only), FT (Full time)<br>PGDip in Social Work (Masters exit route only), WBL (Work based learning) |
| Date of initial assessment | 15 December 2017   |
| Case reference             | CAS-12573-G5F0M0   |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4 : Visitors’ recommendation .....          | 4 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|                              |                      |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| David Childs                 | Social worker        |
| Carol Ainley                 | Biomedical scientist |
| Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah | HCPC executive       |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name         | MA Social Work           |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)           |
| Profession             | Social worker in England |
| First intake           | 01 January 2014          |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 3                  |
| Intakes per year       | 1                        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07351                  |

|                |                           |
|----------------|---------------------------|
| Programme name | MA Social Work            |
| Mode of study  | WBL (Work based learning) |
| Profession     | Social worker in England  |

|                        |                 |
|------------------------|-----------------|
| First intake           | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 3         |
| Intakes per year       | 1               |
| Assessment reference   | AM07352         |

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | PGDip in Social Work (Masters exit route only) |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                                 |
| Profession             | Social worker in England                       |
| First intake           | 01 January 2014                                |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 2  |
| Intakes per year       | 1  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07353  |

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | PGDip in Social Work (Masters exit route only) |
| Mode of study          | WBL (Work based learning)                      |
| Profession             | Social worker in England                       |
| First intake           | 01 January 2014                                |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 2  |
| Intakes per year       | 1  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07354  |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation   | Submitted |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes       |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes       |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes       |

## Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 18 January 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust                         |
| Validating body          | University of Oxford                                       |
| Name of programme(s)     | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin Psych), Full time |
| Date submission received | 30 November 2017   |
| Case reference           | CAS-12451-H1V1R6   |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation .....           | 3 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Lincoln Simmonds | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Ruth Baker       | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Amal Hussein     | HCPC executive                                    |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin Psych) |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                                  |
| Profession             | Practitioner psychologist                       |
| Modality               | Clinical psychologist                           |
| First intake           | 01 January 2000                                 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15  |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07356   |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| <b>Required documentation</b>  | <b>Submitted</b> |
|--|------------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes              |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes<br>Yes       |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes<br>Yes       |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes<br>Yes       |

**Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation**

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 18 January 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| Education provider         | University of Plymouth   |
| Name of programme(s)       | BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cellular Science), FT (Full time)<br>BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science), FT (Full time)<br>BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science), FT (Full time) |
| Date of initial assessment | 15 December 2017   |
| Case reference             | CAS-12387-D7B7L9   |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4 : Visitors' recommendation .....          | 3 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|                              |                      |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| Carol Ainley                 | Biomedical scientist |
| David Childs                 | Social worker        |
| Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah | HCPC executive       |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cellular Science) |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                                   |
| Profession             | Biomedical scientist                             |
| First intake           | 01 September 2014                                |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 24   |
| Intakes per year       | 1  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07368  |

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science) |
| Mode of study  | FT (Full time)                                    |
| Profession     | Biomedical scientist                              |

|                        |                   |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| First intake           | 01 September 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 24          |
| Intakes per year       | 1                 |
| Assessment reference   | AM07369           |

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science) |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                                |
| Profession             | Biomedical scientist                          |
| First intake           | 01 September 2014                             |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 24                                      |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07377                                       |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation  | Submitted |
|---|-----------|
| HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                          | Yes       |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                         | Yes       |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years            | Yes       |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 18 January 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#)

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| Education provider         | Sheffield Hallam University  |
| Name of programme(s)       | Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Full time<br>Master of Social Work, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 15 December 2017   |
| Case reference             | CAS-12505-C0Z8N2   |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation .....           | 3 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|               |                       |
|---------------|-----------------------|
| Graham Noyce  | Social worker         |
| Richard Sykes | Hearing aid dispenser |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive        |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only) |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)  |
| Profession             | Social worker in England                                      |
| First intake           | 01 December 2007  |
| Maximum student cohort | Up to 15  |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07427   |

|                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name         | Master of Social Work    |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)           |
| Profession             | Social worker in England |
| First intake           | 01 January 2014          |
| Maximum student cohort | Up to 15                 |
| Intakes per year       | 1                        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07433                  |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation   | Submitted  |
|--|------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes        |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes<br>Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes<br>Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes<br>Yes |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 18 January 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| Education provider         | Sheffield Hallam University   |
| Name of programme(s)       | BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time<br>BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 15 December 2017  |
| Case reference             | CAS-12504-M4L0L3  |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review.....           | 3 |
| Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation .....           | 4 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|               |                       |
|---------------|-----------------------|
| Graham Noyce  | Social worker         |
| Richard Sykes | Hearing aid dispenser |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive        |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name         | BA (Hons) Social Work    |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)           |
| Profession             | Social worker in England |
| First intake           | 01 September 2004        |
| Maximum student cohort | Up to 76                 |
| Intakes per year       | 1                        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07428                  |

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work |
| Mode of study  | FT (Full time)   |
| Profession     | Social worker in England                                 |

|                        |                   |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| First intake           | 01 September 2017 |
| Maximum student cohort | Up to 25          |
| Intakes per year       | 1                 |
| Assessment reference   | AM07429           |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation   | Submitted  |
|--|------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes        |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes<br>Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes<br>Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes<br>Yes |

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

#### Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

#### 6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

**Reason:** The visitors read the documentation for the BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work programme. The audit form detailed that there had been a change to the modules for the managing public health and leadership and management for excellence in relationship centred care. Whilst the visitors could see the approved

curriculum modification form, they could not see the two embedded documents that showed the rationale for the changes. Therefore, the visitors were unclear as to what the changes for the modules are. Therefore the visitors require to see the embedded rationale documents to be assured that this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested evidence:** The embedded documents in the approved curriculum modification form, that demonstrates the changes made to the modules.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 18 January 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| Education provider         | Sheffield Hallam University   |
| Name of programme(s)       | [PG Cert Approved Mental Health Professional (AMHP), Full time<br>PG Cert Approved Mental Health Professional (AMHP), Part time |
| Date of initial assessment | 15 December 2017  |
| Case reference             | CAS-12411-H0V7T1  |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation .....           | 3 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| Graham Noyce  | Social worker (Approved mental health professional) |
| Richard Sykes | Hearing aid dispenser                               |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive                                      |
|               |   |

## Section 2: Programme details

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| Programme name | PG Cert Approved Mental Health Professional (AMHP) |
| Mode of study  | FT (Full time)                                     |
| Profession     | Social worker in England                           |
| Entitlement    | Approved mental health professional                |
| First intake   | 01 September 2015                                  |

|                        |          |
|------------------------|----------|
| Maximum student cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year       | 1        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07435  |

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | PG Cert Approved Mental Health Professional (AMHP) |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)                                     |
| Profession             | Social worker in England                           |
| Entitlement            | Approved mental health professional                |
| First intake           | 01 September 2015                                  |
| Maximum student cohort | Up to 20   |
| Intakes per year       | 1  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07436  |

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation   | Submitted  |
|--|------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes        |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes<br>Yes |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes<br>Yes |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes<br>Yes |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 18 January 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Education provider   | Teesside University   |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice, Teesside University, Full time |
| Date of assessment   | 15 December 2017  |
| Case reference       | CAS-12574-J2J8K4  |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation .....           | 3 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|                   |                        |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Rosemary Furner   | Independent prescriber |
| Tristan Henderson | Paramedic              |
| Eloise O'Connell  | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                               |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                |
| Profession             | Paramedic                     |
| First intake           | 01 January 2014               |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40                      |
| Intakes per year       | 1                             |
| Assessment reference   | AM07460                       |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation   | Submitted |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes       |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes       |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes       |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 18 January 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| Education provider   | University of South Wales  |
| Name of programme(s) | Supplementary Prescribing, University of South Wales, Part time<br>Independent Prescribing, University of South Wales, Part time |
| Date of assessment   | 15 December 2017   |
| Case reference       | CAS-12430-H3M7M3   |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review.....           | 3 |
| Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation .....           | 4 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|                   |                        |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Rosemary Furner   | Independent prescriber |
| Tristan Henderson | Paramedic              |
| Eloise O'Connell  | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                           |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Programme name         | Supplementary Prescribing |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)            |
| Entitlement            | Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake           | 01 September 2014         |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 35                  |
| Intakes per year       | 1                         |
| Assessment reference   | AM07498                   |

|                |                         |
|----------------|-------------------------|
| Programme name | Independent Prescribing |
| Mode of study  | PT (Part time)          |
| Entitlement    | Independent prescribing |
| First intake   | 01 September 2015       |

|                        |          |
|------------------------|----------|
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 35 |
| Intakes per year       | 2        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07499  |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation   | Submitted | Reason(s) for non-submission  |
|--|-----------|---|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |   |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | No        | The education provider has not provided internal quality reports for the last two years, as there has been no enrolled learners for the last two years. |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes       |   |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes       |   |

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

#### Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

### **B.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.**

**Reason:** The education provider has informed us that there have been no enrolled learners on the programme for the last two years. In evidencing how this standard continues to be met, the education provider has provided a funding letter from Welsh Government for 2017/18 for the programmes. However the visitors are not clear who this funding applies to, for example, if this includes allied health professional learners. From this evidence, the visitors are unclear whether the programme has run for any profession in the last two years, or whether it will run for any profession in the 2017/18 academic year. Therefore the visitors are not clear how the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that demonstrates that this standard continues to be met.

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

**Reason:** The education provider has not provided internal quality reports for the last two years, with the reason that there have not been any enrolled learners for the last two years on the programmes. However on review of the documentation, the visitors note that there are currently learners on the programmes though it is not clear which professions these learners are from. The education provider has provided external examiner reports and responses for the last two years, therefore the visitors are unclear how the internal monitoring processes are working to consider and report on external examiner reports. The visitors were unclear why the provider noted this programme is not running when it seems from the external monitoring documentation that there are learners on the programmes. The visitors are unclear why internal quality monitoring processes appear to have not been completed for the programmes for the last two academic years.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that demonstrates the internal monitoring processes are being followed.

## **Section 5: Visitors' recommendation**

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 18 January 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Education provider   | University of Worcester   |
| Name of programme(s) | V300 Independent Prescribing Conversion Course (For Registered Supplementary Prescribers), PT (Part time)<br>V300 Non-Medical (Independent and Supplementary) Prescribing Programme, PT (Part time) |
| Date of assessment   | 15 December 2017  |
| Case reference       | CAS-12440-V1L8P0  |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation .....           | 3 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|                   |                        |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Rosemary Furner   | Independent prescriber |
| Tristan Henderson | Paramedic              |
| Eloise O'Connell  | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | V300 Independent Prescribing Conversion Course (For Registered Supplementary Prescribers) |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)  |
| Entitlement            | Independent prescribing   |
| First intake           | 01 February 2014  |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30  |
| Intakes per year       | 2   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07526   |

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | V300 Non-Medical (Independent and Supplementary) Prescribing Programme |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)   |
| Entitlement            | Independent prescribing  |
| First intake           | 01 February 2014   |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30   |
| Intakes per year       | 2  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07527  |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation   | Submitted |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes       |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes       |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes       |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 18 January 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).