

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Academy for Healthcare Science
Name of programme(s)	Certificate of Equivalence, Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 February 2018
Case reference	CAS-12291-R4X0M6

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:

Ruth Ashbee	Clinical scientist
Stephen Boynes	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Certificate of Equivalence
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Clinical scientist
First intake	01 October 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 500
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07140

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.

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

Reason: From a review of the standards of education and trainings (SETs) mapping document the visitors noted that on SET 6.5, the outcome of the assessment process were previously ratified by the AHCS Education, Training and Professional Standards Committee. From May 2017, ratification transferred to the Regulation Council while a new chair of ETPSC was being appointed to reflect the regulatory implications of the decision made in the ratification process. A new chair of ETPSC has been appointed but it has been decided that the current arrangement will continue. From the information provided the visitors were unable to determine the implications of transferring to the Regulation Council and how this new arrangement ensures the measurement of student performance continues to be objective and ensures fitness to practise.

Suggested evidence: Further clarification of the implications of transferring to the Regulation Council and how this new arrangement ensures the measurement of student performance continue to be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

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 22 March 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	Anglia Ruskin University
Name of programme(s)	FDS <i>c</i> in Hearing Aid Audiology, Distance learning
Date of initial assessment	15 February 2018
Case reference	CAS-12331-D0R0T7

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

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:

Hugh Crawford	Hearing aid dispenser
Tina Pyman	Arts therapist - Dramatherapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	FDS in Hearing Aid Audiology
Mode of study	DL (Distance learning)
Profession	Hearing aid dispenser
First intake	01 July 2008
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 92
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07154

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 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

In the documentation provided, the education provider has highlighted a steady increase in learner numbers. The numbers have increased from 72 learners in 2015 to 92 learners in the 2016-17 academic year. From the information provided, the visitors noted that the education provider has identified some difficulty with providing adequate staff to support the increase in learners. The visitors noted that the education provider has an action plan in place which anticipates that there will be sufficient staff to support the programme by September 2018. The education provider will need to consider how they will demonstrate this has been achieved and that the standards continue to be met in future HCPC monitoring.

The External Examiner's report for 2016-17 identified that there has been cases where learners have not received adequate support in the practice-based learning environment in the workplace. The external examiner also noted that it is not possible under the current arrangements to audit the supervision of learners on their placement, and identified the importance to find a consensus with the employers of the very few supervisors which do not support their students sufficiently at the workplace. The

visitors understand that the education provider is aware of this, and has plan in place to monitor staff support for learners to ensure that staffing levels are adequate to provide sufficient support for all learners. In future HCPC monitoring processes, the education provider will need to consider how they will demonstrate that sufficient support in practice-based learning is achieved and maintained, and how they continue to monitor and evaluate practice-based learning in order to demonstrate how they continue to meet the standards in SET 5.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	British Psychological Society
Name of programme(s)	Qualification in Sport and Exercise Psychology (Stage 2), Flexible
Postal Date submission received	08 December 2017
Case reference	CAS-12283-C1M2G7

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:

Sandra Wolfson	Practitioner psychologist - Sport and exercise psychologist
Robert Stratford	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Qualification in Sport and Exercise Psychology (Stage 2)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Sport and exercise psychologist
First intake	01 January 2008
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 75
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07176

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 22 March 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)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 February 2018
Case reference	CAS-12302-F7G5Z3

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: Future considerations for the programme(s).....	3

Executive Summary

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

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

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:

Patricia Higham	Social worker
Niall Gooch	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 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07237

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 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

The visitor would like to note that the HCPC does not appear to have been notified of the appointment of the previous programme lead, Janet Phillips. For approved programmes, the HCPC should be notified of all changes including changes to the role of programme leader via the major change process. This will enable HCPC visitors to make an assessment of whether that person is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on the relevant part of the register.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Institute of Arts in Therapy and Education
Validating body	University of East London
Name of programme(s)	MA Integrative Arts Psychotherapy, Part time
Date submission received	09 January 2018
Case reference	CAS-12335-S1Y3R5

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

John Crossfield	Arts therapist - Art therapist
Philippa Brown	Arts therapist - Art therapist
Jasmine Oduro-Bonsrah	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA Integrative Arts Psychotherapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Art therapist
First intake	01 October 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07281

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 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. The visitors noted in the audit form that the education provider had filled out the last column, although there had been no changes to the programme. For future monitoring processes, if there have been no changes to the programme the education provider will not need to provide evidence. Filling out the "In which document / on which page of the document can this information be found?" section could potentially mislead visitors into making decisions about standards that have been assessed previously.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Keele University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 February 2018
Case reference	CAS-12356-X6R8L6

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

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:

Patricia Higham	Social worker
Niall Gooch	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 April 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07283

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	Internal quality document for two years ago is not included as only one internal audit has taken place for the School over the last two years.
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	

Section 4: 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 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

The visitor would like to note that the HCPC does not appear to have been notified of the appointment of the previous programme lead, Mo Ray. For approved programmes, for the time being the HCPC should be notified of all changes to the role of programme leader via the major change process. This will enable HCPC visitors to make an assessment of whether that person is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on the relevant part of the register.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Keele University
Name of programme(s)	MA Social Work, Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 February 2018
Case reference	CAS-12337-L7Y1R5

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

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:

Patricia Higham	Social worker
Niall Gooch	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 April 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07287

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	Internal quality document for two years ago is not included as only one internal audit has taken place for the School over the last two years.
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	

Section 4: 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 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

The visitor would like to note that the HCPC does not appear to have been notified of the appointment of the previous programme lead, Mo Ray. For approved programmes, the HCPC should be notified of all changes including the changes to role of programme leader via the major change process. This will enable HCPC visitors to make an assessment of whether that person is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on the relevant part of the register.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	London South Bank University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time
Date submission received	26 January 2018
Case reference	CAS-12345-J7P2L1

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 Bevan	Operating department practitioner
Joanne Thomas	Operating department practitioner
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07313

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 22 March 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 South Bank University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Part time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Work based learning BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 February 2018
Case reference	CAS-12367-V2V0H8

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.

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:

Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah	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 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 17
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07319

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 4
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07320

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2008
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07322

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 year	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 the documentation provided the visitors noted in the 2016-17 internal quality report that there have been significant staff changes. The visitors note that four members of staff left the team and one member was recruited in the 2016-17 academic year. Furthermore, the visitors learnt from the documentation that for the full time programme there was an increase in learner numbers from 26 to 42 in September 2016. In the documentation submitted the visitors did not see any evidence of any plans to recruit more staff and there were no major changes submitted to highlight the changes. The education provider must therefore, submit evidence which demonstrates that the programme continues to have an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff to deliver the programme effectively.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the plans in place to ensure there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experience staff to deliver the programme effectively.

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted in the 2016-17 internal quality report that there have been significant staff changes. Experienced members of staff are no longer delivering the programme. The visitors did not see any evidence of the plans in place to ensure that the staff members who replace the previous members will have the relevant expertise and knowledge. The education provider did not previously highlight these changes to the HCPC. Therefore to ensure that the programme continues to meet the standards the education provider must demonstrate that the subject areas are taught by staff with the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the plans in place to ensure that the subject areas are taught by staff with the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors learnt that the programme over recruited learners for the 2016-17 academic year. For the full time programme there was an increase in learner numbers from 26 to 42. The education provider stated in the internal quality report for the 2016-17 that the “increased numbers presented rooming and placement challenges ... noted that the resultant additional workload has been absorbed by the academic team with limited additional resource allocation”. The education provider did not highlight these changes to the HCPC and did not submit any

evidence to support the changes. The visitors note that the increase in learner numbers has an impact on how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate that there are sufficient, appropriate resources to support the delivery of the learning and teaching activities of the programme.

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: In the evidence provided, the visitors noted that the programme over recruited learners for the 2016-17 academic year. For the full time programme there was an increase in learner numbers from 26 to 42. The education provider stated in the internal quality report for the 2016-17 that the “increased numbers presented rooming and placement challenges”. The visitor also saw in the documentation that “particular challenges occurred in semester 2 in relation to sourcing and allocation of placements and this has been considered within the action plan for the next academic year”. The education provider did not highlight any changes to the HCPC or submit any evidence to demonstrate that there continues to be an adequate number and range of practice placement appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and achievement of the learning outcomes.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which demonstrates that there continues to be an adequate number and range of practice placements appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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 22 March 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)

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. From telephone conversations with the education provider and evidence provided for section 4, the visitors were informed that 42 learners will be recruited for the programme moving forward. The visitors reviewed evidence which demonstrated how the standards will continue to be met, with the increase in learner numbers. The education provider should inform the HCPC about any changes to the programmes once these changes occur.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	London South Bank University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography, Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 February 2018
Case reference	CAS-12346-V4K5N9

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:

Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 14
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07325

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.

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

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted in the external examiner report for the 2015-16 academic year that there were several comments and questions that were not answered. The education provider did not address the questions about feedback on the Radiotherapy Theory and Practice B. They also did not answer the question on whether the regulations allow a mark to be awarded in cases where there is a breach of confidentiality for example. The visitors saw no evidence in the response to the external examiner’s report and internal quality report for the 2015-16 academic year that these concerns had been addressed.

Additionally, the visitors note that part B of the external examiner's report for the 2016-17 academic year was missing as part of the submission and therefore could not determine what issues were raised and how they were actioned. .

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate that the external examiner's comments are adequately addressed to ensure that the assessment standards are appropriate. The education provider must also submit part B of the external examiner's report for the 2016-17 academic year.

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 22 March 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 South Bank University
Name of programme(s)	Pg Dip Therapeutic Radiography, Full time MSc Therapeutic Radiography, Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 February 2018
Case reference	CAS-12362-C1K6Z0

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:

Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Pg Dip Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 8
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07324

Programme name	MSc Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 August 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 9
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07326

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.

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

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted in the external examiner report for the 2015-16 academic year that there were several comments and questions that were not answered. The education provider did not address the questions about feedback on the Radiotherapy Theory and Practice B. They did not also answer the question on whether the regulations allow a mark to be awarded in cases where there is a breach of confidentiality for example. The visitors saw no evidence in the response to the external examiner's report and internal quality report for the 2015-16 academic year that these concerns had been addressed.

Additionally, the visitors note that part B of the external examiner's report for the 2016-17 academic year was missing as part of the submission and therefore could not determine what issues were raised and how they were actioned. .

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate that the external examiner's comments are adequately addressed to ensure that the assessment standards are appropriate. The education provider must also submit part B of the external examiner's report for the 2016-17 academic year.

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 22 March 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)	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Part time Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) , Part time Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 February 2018
Case reference	CAS-12368-J0D7H7

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
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.

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:

Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07357

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07358

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07359

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07367

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 documentation provided the visitors noted in the internal quality report for the BSc programme that “in comparison with the previous academic year the total number of enrolments increased from 176 to 203. We are unclear if these figures also include the MSc OT (Pre Reg) Programme”. From this information provided, the visitors were unclear, if the number of learners had increased or not and therefore could not make a decision on whether the programme continues to be effectively managed.

If the numbers did increase in the 2015-16 and 2016-17 academic year, this could have an impact on how the following standards continue to be met:

- 3.5 There must be 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.
- 3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.
- 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.
- 5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Suggested evidence: Clarity around the number of learners for each programme. As well as evidence to demonstrate that all the programmes continue to be managed effectively. If the numbers have increased the education provider must provide evidence which demonstrates that standard 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.9, 5.2 and 5.6 continue to be met.

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 22 March 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)

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. The visitors noted in the internal quality report for the BSc programme that there has been a potential increase in learner numbers this academic year (2017-18). The education provider submitted evidence for the areas highlighted in section 4. In the future when there are changes made to the programmes the education provider should inform us through the change notification form.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Plymouth
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 February 2018
Case reference	CAS-12455-R7R2K9

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
Section 6: 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 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:

Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah	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 2008
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07361

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 documentation provided the visitors noted in the internal quality that “in comparison with the previous academic year the total number of enrolments increased from 176 to 203. We are unclear if these figures also include the MSc OT (Pre Reg) Programme”. From this information provided, the visitors were unclear, if the number of learners had increased or not and therefore could not make a decision on whether the programme continues to be effectively managed.

If the numbers have increased in the 2015-16 and 2016-17 academic year, this could have an impact on how the following standards continues to be met:

- 3.5 There must be 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.
- 3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.
- 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.
- 5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Suggested evidence: Clarity around the number of learners for each programme. As well as evidence to demonstrate that all the programmes continue to be managed effectively. If the numbers have increased the education provider must provide evidence which demonstrates that standard 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.9, 5.2 and 5.6 continues to be met.

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 22 March 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)

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. The visitors noted in the internal quality report for the BSc programme that there has been a potential increase in learner numbers this academic year (2017-18). The education provider submitted evidence for the areas highlighted in section 4. In the future when there are changes made to the programme the education provider should inform us through the change notification form

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Queen Margaret University
Name of programme(s)	Aptitude Test in Hearing Aid Dispensing, Distance learning
Date of initial assessment	15 February 2018
Case reference	CAS-12576-G4Q5W8

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:

Hugh Crawford	Hearing aid dispenser
Tina Pyman	Arts therapist - Dramatherapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Aptitude Test in Hearing Aid Dispensing
Mode of study	DL (Distance learning)
Profession	Hearing aid dispenser
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07380

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 22 March 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	Queen Margaret University
Name of programme(s)	Diploma in Higher Education Hearing Aid Audiology, Full time
Date of initial assessment	15 December 2017
Case reference	CAS-12464-S2J6C0

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:

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

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Diploma in Higher Education Hearing Aid Audiology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Hearing aid dispenser
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum student cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07382

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 Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes 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 the visitors reading of the internal annual monitoring reports for 2015-2016 and 2016-2017, they noted that the staffing for the programme was impacted by the increase in learners numbers along with long-term absences of staff at critical teaching periods for the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear if there were sufficient number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme effectively. Therefore the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how the education provider will ensure that there are sufficient appropriately qualified and experienced staff for the programme should there be a further increase in learner numbers and long term absences of staff.

Suggested evidence: Documentation that will demonstrate how the education provider will ensure the staffing will be in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

Reason: From the visitors reading of the internal annual monitoring reports for 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 they noted that the staffing for the programme was impacted by the increase in learners numbers along with long-term absences of staff at critical teaching periods for the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear if there staff in place with the relevant knowledge and expertise in place to deliver the programme effectively. Therefore the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how the education provider will ensure that there are staff with the relevant expertise and knowledge in place for the programme should there be a further increase in learner numbers and long term absences of staff.

Suggested evidence: Documentation that will demonstrate how the education provider will ensure the staff will have the expertise and knowledge to deliver an effective programme.

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

Reason: From the visitors reading of the internal annual monitoring reports for 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 they noted that there was a report of rooms of insufficient size to accommodate the learners on the programme. The visitors were unclear if this is because there has been an increase in student numbers or the rooms are not of sufficient size to accommodate the students on the programme normally. Therefore, the visitors want to see further evidence that demonstrates how the education provider is ensuring that the rooms are appropriate to support learner learning for the programme.

Suggested evidence: Documentation that demonstrates the education provider ensures that the rooms for the programme are appropriately sized to support the learners learning 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 22 March 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	Queen Margaret University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 February 2018
Case reference	CAS-12575-G1K2D8

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:

Alison Wishart	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration)
Joanna Jackson	Physiotherapist
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 October 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07386

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.

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

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors noted that in the internal quality monitoring reports 2015-16 and 2016-17 there had been a significant number of staff absences. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that there are an appropriate number of staff in place to deliver the programme effectively. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested evidence: Further documentation to demonstrate that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective 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 22 March 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	Queen Margaret University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Diagnostic Radiography (pre-registration), Full time PgDip Diagnostic Radiography (pre-registration), Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 February 2018
Case reference	CAS-12480-H1G7H3

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:

Ruth Ashbee	Clinical scientist
Stephen Boynes	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Diagnostic Radiography (pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 January 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 8
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07398

Programme name	PgDip Diagnostic Radiography (pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer

Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 January 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 4
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07401

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 22 March 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	Queen Margaret University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Music Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	19 January 2018
Case reference	CAS-12481-D7B9D1

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 Streeter	Arts therapist - Music therapist
Pauline Etkin	Arts therapist - Music therapist
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Music Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Music therapist
First intake	01 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07405

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 22 March 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 Robert Gordon University
Name of programme(s)	Non Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 9), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Non Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 11), Part time
Date of initial assessment	13 February 2018
Case reference	CAS-12406-V8Z2W8

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Matthew Catterall	Paramedic
Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 9)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07410

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)

Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07412

Programme name	Non Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 11)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07415

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: 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.

C.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Reason: The education provider has previously mentioned mapping of the curriculum to the Royal Pharmaceutical Society (RPS) Competency Framework for all Prescribers. The visitors note that the RPS prescribing framework was updated in July 2016. From the information provided, the visitors were not clear whether the education provider has mapped the learning outcomes to the revised RPS competency framework. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to determine how the programmes continue to reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge based as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance, such as the revised RPS competency framework for all prescribers.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate that the programmes continue to meet this standard, with respect to relevant guidance.

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 22 March 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)	Pharmacotherapeutics in Prescribing, Part time
Date submission received	19 December 2017
Case reference	CAS-12424-J5G1F2

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:

Gordon Burrow	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration)
Catherine Smith	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – sale / supply)
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Pharmacotherapeutics in Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 November 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07479

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 22 March 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)	Certificate in Medicines Management (Conversion to Independent Prescribing), Part time Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management (Independent and Supplementary Prescribing), Part time Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management (Supplementary Prescribing), Part time
Date submission received	23 January 2018
Case reference	CAS-12530-G2S1F4

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:

Alaster Rutherford	Independent prescriber
James Pickard	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Independent prescriber)
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Certificate in Medicines Management (Conversion to Independent Prescribing)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 February 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07482

Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management (Independent and Supplementary Prescribing)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 February 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07491

Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management (Supplementary Prescribing)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 February 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07492

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 22 March 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](#).