

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Name of programme(s)	MA Dramatherapy, Full time
Date submission received	06 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-12275-K4F4K0

### 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:

Belinda Sherlock	Arts therapist - Dramatherapist
Jane Fisher-Norton	Arts therapist - Dramatherapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA Dramatherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Dramatherapist
First intake	01 September 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07146

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
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 05 July 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	The University of Bolton
Name of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing IP and/or SP (HE6), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing IP and/or SP (HE7), Part time
Date of initial assessment	13 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-12587-V8J3P1

### 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).....	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.

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:

Gemma Quinn	Independent prescriber
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing IP and/or SP (HE6)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07170

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing IP and/or SP (HE7)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)

Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07171

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 05 July 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)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

The education provider has noted that they intend to make significant changes to their prescribing programmes to update the programmes in preparation for reaccreditation with the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) and the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC). The education provider must submit a major change if they intend to make significant changes to their prescribing programmes which will impact how programmes continue to meet the HCPC standards for prescribing.

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Cardiff University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Full time
Date submission received	10 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-12312-J5F3Y7

### 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:

Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Beverley Ball	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 22
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07189

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
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 05 July 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 Edinburgh
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol), Full time Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol), Flexible
Date submission received	17 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-12318-P5C9X1

### 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:

Stephen Davies	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Lincoln Simmonds	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 1995
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07216

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07217

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 University internal Quality Assurance and Enhancement (QAE) process changed during 2015 - 2016 such that the standard QAE report was not produced for that academic year. As well as new paperwork and procedures, the reporting schedule changed and so any QAE recommendations for 2015 - 2016 were reported in the 2016 - 2017 report under the new Annual Programme Monitoring process. So there is no separate internal quality report for 2015 - 2016, rather the 2016 - 2017 report contains the information for both the preceding academic years.

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 05 July 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	Edge Hill University
Name of programme(s)	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice, Full time
Date of initial assessment	19 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-12300-C1J5Z5

### 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:

Glyn Harding	Paramedic
Luke Tibbits	Social worker
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	AM07222

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: 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.

#### 3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

**Reason:** From the response to the external examiner's annual report 2016–17 the visitors noted that the Faculty's Operating Department Practice and Paramedic provision have been merged into a single department. In addition, the visitors noted that this single department has now moved to St James's House. However, the visitors were not provided with any evidence of the new programme management structure or evidence relating to the move to St James's House. Without this information, the visitors were unable to determine that the programme continues to be effectively managed in light of the changes mentioned.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence the programme continues to be effectively managed. In particular further evidence of the new programme management structures, lines of responsibility and rationale for the move to St James's House.

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

**Reason:** From the response to external examiner's annual report 2016–17 the visitors noted the paramedic provision has moved to St James's House. However, the visitors were not provided with any information relating to the resources in place at St James's House. As such, the visitors were unable to determine that the resources in place continues to be effectively used to support student learning in all settings.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence that the programme continues to effectively use resources to support student learning in light of the move to St James's House.

### **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 05 July 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 Essex
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Part time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-12301-S0Q3X6

### 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 Houlston	Biomedical scientist
Joanne Stead	Occupational therapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07234

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist

First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07247

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes 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 05 July 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 Essex
Name of programme(s)	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-12328-B3T4P3

### 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 Houlston	Biomedical scientist
Joanne Stead	Occupational therapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07242

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)

Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07243

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes 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 05 July 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 Essex
Name of programme(s)	Practice Certificate in Supplementary and Independent Prescribing for PHs, CHs and RAs, Part time
Date submission received	22 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-13231-K2T6Y8

### 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:

Alaster Rutherford	Independent prescriber
Nicholas Haddington	Independent prescriber
Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Practice Certificate in Supplementary and Independent Prescribing for PHs, CHs and RAs
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 March 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07567

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 05 July 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	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Full time
Date of initial assessment	15 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-12304-P2K4W0

### 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:

Beverley Ball	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 55
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07249

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
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 05 July 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	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, Full time
Date of initial assessment	18 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-12320-N6J3D6

### 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 .....	5
Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s).....	5

### 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.

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:

Ian Davies	Biomedical scientist
Jai Shree Adhyaru	Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist
Eloise O'Connell	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 September 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07252

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: 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.

### 3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

**Reason:** On review of the documentation provided for this audit, the visitors noted concerns have been raised in relation to an increase in learner numbers on the programme, and the resources in place to support the increase in numbers. The 'Annual Programme Analysis Report' for the 2016 – 17 period, states "BMS Target number have been increased to unmanageable levels". Further to this, the 'Annual Programme Analysis Report' for the 2015 – 16 states "Maths and statistics provision was withdrawn by SEBS for Session 15/16 and the required content was distributed across all years of the programme at appropriate points rather than attempting to replace the previous provision with a single module. It proved extremely difficult to do this due to lack of support staff." The visitors note that the education provider has not previously informed the HCPC of a significant increase in learner numbers. Therefore, the visitors require further information about how the education provider plans to

manage the increase in learner numbers and how staff are supported on the programme to manage the increase, in order to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested evidence:** Further information on how the education provider plans to manage the programme with the increase in learner numbers.

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

**Reason:** The 'Programme Board Response to External Assessors Reports' for the 2015-16 period states that the external examiner felt that "large increase in cohort size / student numbers in level 3 cohort has had an impact on the ability of the academic team to support them. There has not been an increase in staff as far as she was aware to support the students". In the report, the action in response to this highlights that remedial support has been given to students who failed modules, and extra tutorials in some modules will be added for session 17/18. From the information provided, the visitors were not clear what the education provider had done to address the number of staff on the programme in relation to the increase in learner numbers. The visitors note that from the information provided, the programme has had a significant increase in learner numbers. However, the visitors note that the education provider has not previously informed HCPC of this change. Therefore, the visitors require further information from the education provider that demonstrates there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Further information to demonstrate how the education provider ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

**Reason:** On review of the documentation provided for this audit, the visitors noted concerns have been raised in relation to increase in learner numbers on the programme, and the resources in place to support the increase in numbers. The 'Annual Programme Analysis Report' for 2015 – 16 period states "Student numbers across the suite are now at levels that may have an adverse impact on the student experience in future unless investment in staff (academic and technical), equipment and facilities is increased". Further to this, the 'Programme Board Response to External Assessors Report' for the 2016-17 period states that the external examiner commented "There are not enough microbiology laboratory projects to go to the numbers of students doing that degree option... student numbers are increasing and this problem may therefore escalate and needs addressing in the short and longer term". The action response from the education provider states "...this appears to have addressed this issue, however increasing student numbers will have an impact in the management of project allocation in future years". From the information provided, the visitors could not see that the education provider has a plan in place to ensure that the resources to support student learning in all settings will effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Further information to demonstrate how the education provider continues to meet this standard.

## 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 05 July 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 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

From the information provided in this submission, the visitors were satisfied that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training. The visitors recognise that the education provider has made plans in response to resourcing issues. This includes appointment of a new member of staff, advertisement of a further member of staff, and assurance that the applied biomedical science route remains static. However, the visitors note that the education provider is still working out issues it has had with resourcing, such as increased teaching loads across the department. As such, the visitors require the education provider to submit information in the next annual monitoring audit to demonstrate how they continue to meet the standards of education and training, in particular the standards around resourcing and staffing.

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition and Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	06 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-12538-C0P0M1

### 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:

Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Pauline Douglas	Dietitian
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 January 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07253

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
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 05 July 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	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Dietetics, Full time MSc Dietetics, Part time Pg Dip Dietetics (Pre-Registration), Full time
Date submission received	27 March 2018
Case reference	CAS-12347-Z0S5F3

### 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:

Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Pauline Douglas	Dietitian
Jasmine Oduro-Bonsrah	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 December 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07254

Programme name	MSc Dietetics
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 December 2002

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07255

Programme name	Pg Dip Dietetics (Pre-Registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07256

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 05 July 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	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	D.Psych in Counselling Psychology, Full time D.Psych in Counselling Psychology, Part time
Date of initial assessment	18 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-12385-Q1T3M3

### 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:

Ian Davies	Biomedical scientist
Jai Shree Adhyaru	Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	D.Psych in Counselling Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07258

Programme name	D.Psych in Counselling Psychology
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07259

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes 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: 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.

### **2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.**

**Reason:** The education provider has provided an updated 'School Fitness to Practice Policy' in relation to standard 3.16, that there must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about student's profession-related conduct. Section 8.5 of the updated policy states "For applicants who have declared a relevant criminal conviction and then go on to accept their offer with the University, once all disclosure forms have been received they will be referred to the Criminal Convictions Panel for consideration". From this information, the visitors were not clear, at what point the admission procedures applies appropriate selection and entry criteria, if a criminal conviction is not reviewed until after the applicant accepts an offer on the programme. As such, the visitors require further information from the education provider that demonstrates the admissions procedures apply appropriate selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

**Suggested evidence:** Further information to demonstrate how the programme continues to meet this standard.

### **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 05 July 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 Glasgow
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy), Full time
Date submission received	15 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-12351-H1Y4Z4

### 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:

James McManus	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Gary Robinson	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 1995
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 23
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07268

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 05 July 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	Glyndwr University
Name of programme(s)	Prof Cert (Practice Certificate In Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for AHP's at level 7), Part time Professional Certificate (Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for AHPs at level 7), Part time Professional Certificate (Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for AHPs at level 6), Part time
Date of initial assessment	13 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-12352-G7T2K4

### 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).....	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.

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:

Gemma Quinn	Independent prescriber
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Tamara Wasylec	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Prof Cert (Practice Certificate In Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for AHP's at level 7)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 January 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07271

Programme name	Professional Certificate (Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for AHPs at level 7)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 June 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07272

Programme name	Professional Certificate (Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for AHPs at level 6)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 June 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07273

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes 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 05 July 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)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

The education provider has noted that the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) and the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) are revising their standards for prescribing. Should the education provider make significant changes to their prescribing programmes in order to meet the above revised standards, they must submit a major change so we can consider how the changes will impact how the programmes continue to meet the HCPC standards for prescribing.

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Goldsmiths, University of London
Name of programme(s)	MA Art Psychotherapy, Full time MA Art Psychotherapy, Part time
Date submission received	26 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-12388-G8W8V5

### 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:

Julie Allan	Arts therapist - Art therapist
Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA Art Psychotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Art therapist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07275

Programme name	MA Art Psychotherapy
----------------	----------------------

Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Art therapist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07276

The maximum learner numbers are applied across both programmes.

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: 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.

#### **4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.**

**Reason:** The visitors noted that in the student handbook, three of the module descriptors make reference to learning outcomes that 'ensure safe and effective practice' and the 2016/17 quality action plan acknowledges the requirement to update curricula to reflect the revised HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. However, it is not clear from the evidence provided how the changes to the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are communicated to learners and it is not clear how the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are taught across the curricula. Therefore the visitors require evidence that shows how the action plan to implement the standards of conduct, performance and ethics to the curricula will occur.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of how the education provider is communicating the revised standards of conduct, performance and ethics and their implications to learners and how the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are taught across the curricula.

#### **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 05 July 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	London Ambulance Service NHS Trust
Name of programme(s)	Paramedic Programme, Work based learning
Date submission received	9 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-12359-G7X5C4

### 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:

Susan Boardman	Paramedic
Gordon Pollard	Paramedic
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Paramedic Programme
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 October 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 18
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	AM07290

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
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 05 July 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	Leeds Beckett University
Name of programme(s)	Pg Dip Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	18 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-12342-S2H7K6

### 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:

Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Susan Lennie	Dietitian
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Pg Dip Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 1995
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 32
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07304

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
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 05 July 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	Leeds Beckett University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time
Date of initial assessment	18 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-12366-Q5N7D5

### 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:

David Abrahart	Approved mental health professional
Lucy Myers	Speech and language therapist
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07308

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
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.

#### **5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.**

**Reason:** From the information provided in the annual review report 2016/17 the visitors noted that students work was in the “long arm placement” model in a practice placement setting without onsite supervision from a speech and language therapist which had been expanded this year. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how the practice placement setting was safe and supportive for students. The visitors therefore require evidence to determine that the practice placement setting continues to be safe and supportive.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that the practice placement setting continues to be safe and supportive for learners.

### **5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Reason:** As the visitors were unable to determine the expansion of practice placement setting model was effective they were unable to determine that there was an adequate number of appropriately, qualified and experienced staff in the practice placement setting. In order for the visitors to be able to make a judgement on whether this standard continues to be met, the education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that there are an adequate number of experienced staff in place to support students in the practice placement setting.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that the practice placement setting continues to have an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

### **5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.**

**Reason:** As the visitors were unable to determine that there was an adequate number of appropriately, qualified and experienced staff in the practice placement setting they were unable to establish if the practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience required. In order for the visitors to be able to make a judgement on whether this standard continues to be met, the education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that the practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support students in a safe environment for effective learning.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that the practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support students in a safe environment for effective learning.

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

**Reason:** From the review of the external examiner reports provided for the academic years 2015/16 and 2016/17 the visitors noted the external examiner raised concerns about the objectivity of marking criteria on the programme. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider monitors and measures student performance. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to determine that the measurement of student performance continues to be objective and ensures their fitness to practice.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that the measurement of student performance continues to be objective and ensures their fitness to practice.

## **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 05 July 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	Medway School of Pharmacy
Validating body	Universities of Greenwich and Kent
Name of programme(s)	Postgraduate Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing, Distance learning Postgraduate Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing, Distance learning
Date of initial assessment	13 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-12348-W5V6L6

### 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:

Gemma Quinn	Independent prescriber
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Tamara Wasylec	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of study	DL (Distance learning)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07329

Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of study	DL (Distance learning)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 May 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07330

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 05 July 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	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date of initial assessment	19 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-12438-Y9P4Z3

### 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:

Glyn Harding	Paramedic
Luke Tibbits	Social worker
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 85
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07335

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: 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.

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

**Reason:** From the programme evaluations document 2016–17, the visitors noted the following statement, “Both the BSc and MA programmes have been rewritten to ensure alignment with PFNA (Programme Framework Northumbria Award) process to be completed during 2018, which will enable further refinement taught content and alignment across the programme”. In the same documentation, the visitors noted that “the external examiner provided individual feedback for modules with some suggestions for minor amendments to some assessments which have been discussed with the module teams with amendments made”. The visitors were not provided with any information of the changes to the curriculum, as such the visitors were unable to determine that the learning outcomes continues to ensure that those who successfully complete the programmes meet the standards of proficiency for social workers.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence of the changes made to modules as a result of the PFNA and feedback from the external examiner.

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

**Reason:** From the programme evaluations document 2016–17, the visitors noted the following statement, “Both the BSc and MA programmes have been rewritten to ensure alignment with PFNA (Programme Framework Northumbria Award) process to be completed during 2018, which will enable further refinement taught content and alignment across the programme”. In the same documentation, the visitors noted that “the external examiner provided individual feedback for modules with some suggestions for minor amendments to some assessments which have been discussed with the module teams with amendments made”. The visitors were not provided with any information of the changes to the assessment strategy; as such, the visitors were unable to determine that the assessment strategy and design ensure that learners who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for social workers.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence of the changes made to the assessment strategy as a result of the PFNA and feedback from external examiner.

## Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, 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 05 July 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	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Name of programme(s)	MA Social Work, Full time
Date of initial assessment	19 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-12535-C2H6G7

### 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 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:

Glyn Harding	Paramedic
Luke Tibbits	Social worker
Amal Hussein	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 December 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07336

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: 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.

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

**Reason:** From the programme evaluations document 2016–17, the visitors noted the following statement, “Both the BSc and MA programmes have been rewritten to ensure alignment with PFNA (Programme Framework Northumbria Award) process to be completed during 2018, which will enable further refinement taught content and alignment across the programme”. In the same documentation, the visitors noted that “the external examiner provided individual feedback for modules with some suggestions for minor amendments to some assessments which have been discussed with the module teams with amendments made”. The visitors were not provided with any information of the changes to the curriculum, as such the visitors were unable to determine that the learning outcomes continues to ensure that those who successfully complete the programmes meet the standards of proficiency for social workers.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence of the changes made to modules as a result of the PFNA and feedback from the external examiner.

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

**Reason:** From the programme evaluations document 2016–17, the visitors noted the following statement, “Both the BSc and MA programmes have been rewritten to ensure alignment with PFNA (Programme Framework Northumbria Award) process to be completed during 2018, which will enable further refinement taught content and alignment across the programme”. In the same documentation, the visitors noted that “the external examiner provided individual feedback for modules with some suggestions for minor amendments to some assessments which have been discussed with the module teams with amendments made”. The visitors were not provided with any information of the changes to the assessment strategy, as such the visitors were unable to determine that the assessment strategy and design ensure that learners who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for social workers.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence of the changes made to the assessment strategy as a result of the PFNA and feedback from external examiner.

#### Section 4: 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 05 July 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)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date of initial assessment	19 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-12384-S2X6L3

### 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:

Glyn Harding	Paramedic
Luke Tibbits	Social worker
Amal Hussein	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 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 90
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07360

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: 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.

#### **2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.**

**Reason:** From a review of the minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2017, the visitors noted that several changes have been made to the admission procedure due to fewer applicants in 2017. In particular the visitors noted that learners who achieve less than 120 credits will still be interviewed as well as the “Faculty has also introduced a numeracy test for students who have achieved academically but do not have Grade C in GCSE Mathematics”. The visitors were not provided with any information that the new requirement is appropriate to the level and content of the programme. As such, the visitors require further evidence that this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence that the new admission requirements are appropriate to the level and content of the programme.

## 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 05 July 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) Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	28 March 2018
Case reference	CAS-12386-R4K8G4

### 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

### 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:

Pauline Douglas	Dietitian
Tracy Clephan	Dietitian
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 February 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07363

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: 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.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the annual monitoring submission, the visitors were provided with a standards of education and training mapping document. In assessing this document, the visitors notice that SET 6 (Assessment) which contains 6 standards relating to the assessment of the programme were left blank. Without this information, the visitors were unable to determine if there had been any changes to the assessment strategy for the programme which could impact on learners meeting the standards of proficiency for Dietitians. The visitors therefore require further evidence of any changes to the assessment strategy for programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence as to where there has been changes to the way the education provider assess learners or the assessment strategy of the programme. In particular, the visitors require a complete SETs mapping document with indication of changes to the programme.

## 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 05 July 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)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-12601-H3Y5Q4

### 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 Houlston	Biomedical scientist
Joanne Stead	Occupational therapist
Eloise O'Connell	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 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 18
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07430

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
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 05 July 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)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time
Date submission received	31 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-12602-C1M1L9

### 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:

Martin Benwell	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Shaaron Pratt	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 55
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07438

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
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 05 July 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)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-12412-T6K1P1

### 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:

Amanda Fitchett	Social worker
Valerie Maehle	Physiotherapist
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1997
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 105
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07439

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
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.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that there was a significant staff shortage due to staff leaving, voluntary redundancy and long term sickness who were not replaced. Additionally, the administrative placement coordinator left and this had an impact on the allocation of placements. As such, the visitors were unable to determine whether there was an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that there are an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme and arrangements are in place to deal with situations such as staff absences.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to demonstrate there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that there were a significant staff shortage due to staff leaving, voluntary redundancy and long term sickness who were not replaced. As such, the visitors were unable to determine whether subject areas were taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that there are staff in place to teach the relevant specialist knowledge and expertise involved in the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to demonstrate there are subject areas, which are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

### **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 05 July 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)	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Full time
Date submission received	01 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-12510-S1Q0B0

### 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:

Jane Day	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07440

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
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 05 July 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)	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-12604-Y3G5H3

### 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 Houlston	Biomedical scientist
Joanne Stead	Occupational therapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07441

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
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 05 July 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	The Smae Institute
Name of programme(s)	Diploma in Local Anaesthesia for Podiatry Practice, Distance learning
Date submission received	10 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-12516-Y0G4R8

### 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:

Catherine Smith	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration)
Sharon Wiener-Ogilvie	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration)
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Diploma in Local Anaesthesia for Podiatry Practice
Mode of study	DL (Distance learning)
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – administration
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07446

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
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 05 July 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	The Smae Institute
Name of programme(s)	Diploma In Prescription Only Medicines for Podiatric Practice, Part time
Date submission received	18 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-12605-W2Z7D0

### 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:

Catherine Smith	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – sale / supply)
Janet Lawrence	Physiotherapist (Independent prescriber)
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Diploma In Prescription Only Medicines for Podiatric Practice
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07447

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.

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 05 July 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 Strathclyde
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics, Full time
Date of initial assessment	25 May 2018
Case reference	CAS-12456-H2T1D3

### 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:

Elaine McCurrach	Prosthetist / orthotist
Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Prosthetist / orthotist
First intake	01 January 1998
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07452

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
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 05 July 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) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time
Date of initial assessment	19 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-12460-W3X4W5

### 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:

Linda Mutema	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07467

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
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.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the course leader report, the visitors noted several staff changes in particular a part-time new senior lecturer in medical imaging as well as, a new module leader for preliminary clinical evaluation module. The visitors were provided for the CV for the part-time senior lecturer and were satisfied that she was appropriate to the role. However, the visitors were not provided with any evidence for the module leader for preliminary clinical evaluation module. As such, the visitor was unable to determine whether this staff member had the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to teach the preliminary clinical evaluation module. The visitor therefore requires evidence to demonstrate that the new module leader has the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge for the role.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence to demonstrate that the new individual appointed has the relevant qualifications and experience to teach the clinical evaluation module.

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

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitor noted that this programme is using the same practice-based learning settings as the BSc Diagnostic Radiography programme. As the BSc Diagnostic Radiography programme has increased their numbers from 40 to 50 learners per cohort and the practice based learning environments are shared between the BSc and MSc pathway for this programme, the visitor was unable to determine how all learners gain access to the available range of learning experiences in a variety of practice environments. The visitor therefore requires evidence to demonstrate that the increased number of learners allows access to a range of practice placements, which are appropriate to the support, and delivery of the programme and achievement of the learning outcomes.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence that there continues to be an appropriate number, duration and range of practice based learning to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes given the increase in numbers.

## 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 05 July 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 Ulster
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Full time
Date of initial assessment	19 March 2018
Case reference	CAS-12431-X8L5L2

### 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:

Helen White	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Shaaron Pratt	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 16
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07481

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>
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: 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.

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

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the programme’s internal monitoring documentation, which mentioned that the programme had over-recruited in the 2016-17 academic year. They were aware from the evidence that there had been some double-teaching on the programme due to these larger than expected numbers. They were therefore unable to be certain that there were an adequate number of staff to deliver the programme effectively.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to demonstrate that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to cover the increase in learner numbers.

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

**Reason:** The visitors were aware from reading the documentary submission that a larger than expected number of learners had been recruited on to the programme in 2016-17. From minutes of Course Committee meetings in both November 2016 and November 2017, the visitors noted that it was still not clear where the extra practice-based learning capacity for these additional learners would be found. They were therefore unable to determine whether all learners on the programme would have access to an appropriate number, duration and range of practice placements.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure access to an appropriate number, duration and range of practice placements for all learners currently on the programme.

## 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 05 July 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 Ulster
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science with DPP (Pathology), Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-12528-Z7R8J6

### 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:

David Houlston	Biomedical scientist
Joanne Stead	Occupational therapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science with DPP (Pathology)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2008
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07484

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: 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.

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

**Reason:** On the audit form the education provider has highlighted a change to the person who has overall professional responsibility, which will now be Mary Hannon-Fletcher, and that her Curriculum Vitae (CV) was attached. However, on review of the information, the visitors could not find a CV included for Mary Hannon-Fletcher. As such, the visitors could not determine whether the new person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and on the relevant part of the Register.

**Suggested evidence:** The CV for Mary Hannon-Fletcher, which is referred to on the audit form.

## 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 05 July 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 Westminster
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences, Part time
Date of initial assessment	13 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-12540-B0S2V7

### 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 Houlston	Biomedical scientist
Joanne Stead	Occupational therapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07507

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
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 05 July 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 Wolverhampton
Name of programme(s)	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DcounsPsy), Part time Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DcounsPsy), Full time
Date of initial assessment	18 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-12437-L5Q0H9

### 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:

Ian Davies	Biomedical scientist
Jai Shree Adhyaru	Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DcounsPsy)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 1
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07513

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DcounsPsy)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 January 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 18
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07517

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes 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: 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.

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

**Reason:** On review of the documentation provided, the visitors noted that the 'Annual Course Report and Quality Monitoring' document states "we are delivering our new version of our course, which includes additional 'added extras' training, including psychometric training EDMR". From the information provided, the visitors were not clear if the 'additional training' was optional, or if it would form part of the core modules on the programme. In addition, the visitors were not clear if the applicant would be required to cover the cost of the additional training, and how this would be communicated. As such, the visitors require further information on the additional training on the programme, whether there are additional costs associated with the training, and how applicants are made aware of this.

**Suggested evidence:** Further information on the additional training on the programme, whether there are additional costs associated with the training, and how this information is communication to applicants.

### **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 05 July 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 Wolverhampton
Name of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing Programme, Part time Non Medical Prescribing Programme, Part time
Date of initial assessment	13 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-12543-D1T5W2

### 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:

Gemma Quinn	Independent prescriber
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing Programme
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 February 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07515

Programme name	Non Medical Prescribing Programme
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing

First intake	01 February 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07520

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 05 July 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 York
Name of programme(s)	Supplementary Prescriber (Level 7), Part time Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Nurses, Midwives and AHPs Level 6, Part time Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Nurses, Midwives and AHPs Level 7, Part time Supplementary Prescriber (Level 6), Part time
Date of initial assessment	13 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-12547-C5L6W8

### 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.....	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:

Gemma Quinn	Independent prescriber
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Tamara Wasylec	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Supplementary Prescriber (Level 7)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 October 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07529

Programme name	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Nurses, Midwives and AHPs Level 6
Mode of study	PT (Part time)

Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 October 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07531

Programme name	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Nurses, Midwives and AHPs Level 7
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 October 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07532

Programme name	Supplementary Prescriber (Level 6)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 October 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07535

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: 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.

#### **A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.**

**Reason:** The education provider submitted an “Application form, Document A.02” which is to be completed by applicants who wish to apply for a place on the programme. The applicant is required to indicate which of four regulatory bodies they are registered with, however there is no option for the HCPC. There is an incorrect reference to the “Healthcare Professions Council”, however this is not the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC). As the reference to the HCPC is incorrect the visitors could not determine how applicants would know which option to select when indicating that they are registered with the HCPC. As such, the visitors require the documentation to be amended to accurately reflect the HCPC on the application form and to ensure applicants are provided with the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Amended Application form, document A.02 which accurately refers to the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) and not the “Healthcare Professions Council”.

## 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 05 July 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 York
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) in Social Work, Full time
Date of initial assessment	18 April 2018
Case reference	CAS-12453-S7X6X5

### 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:

Anne Mackay	Social worker
Richard Barker	Social worker
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07530

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: 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.

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

**Reason:** In the annual programme review 2016–17 section 3, the visitors noted the following statement, “satisfaction with teaching as well as learning resources have been unfortunately offset by substantive decreases with regards to organisation and management that will require further attention”. The visitors were not provided with any evidence of how the education provider has resolved or dealt with this particular issue. In addition, the visitors noted that a low number of learners have engaged in feedback of modules and the education provider recognises this to be an issue. The visitors however, were not provided with any evidence of how the education provider ensures that learners contribute to the evaluation of the programme. The visitors understood that this programme is currently being phased out and the last intake was September 2017. The visitors were unclear whether there continues to be monitoring and evaluation systems in place that are appropriate to, and effective for, the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence to demonstrate that the programme continues to have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place despite the programme being phased out.

## 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 05 July 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](#).