

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Buckinghamshire New University
Name of programme(s)	Dip (HE) Operating Department Practitioner, Full time
Date submission received	04 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15398-L8B8S2

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:

Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Paul Bates	Paramedic
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Dip (HE) Operating Department Practitioner
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09074

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
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement 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 29 January 2020 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	Buckinghamshire New University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time
Date submission received	05 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15403-V0H6M7

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:

Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Paul Bates	Paramedic
John Archibald	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 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09077

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
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement 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 29 January 2020 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	Buckinghamshire New University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice – Apprenticeship, Work based learning BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice with Foundation Year, Full time
Date submission received	05 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15152-Y9C0L3

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:

Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Paul Bates	Paramedic
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice – Apprenticeship
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 August 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09078

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice with Foundation Year
Mode of study	FT (Full time)

Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09079

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
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement 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 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Cardiff University
Name of programme(s)	Postgraduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Post Graduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time
Date submission received	02 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15154-W1K5N2

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Julie-Anne Lowe	Occupational therapist
Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09092

Programme name	Post Graduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09100

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
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement 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 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

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

The visitors were satisfied that all the standards were met at threshold. However, they did note that on page 6 of document 4.1 there was a reference to the 2015 HCPC standards, in the context of the programme's practice outcomes being mapped to professional, regulatory and statutory body (PSRB) standards. These HCPC guidelines have now been superseded by those issued by the Royal Pharmaceutical Society, so the education provider may wish consider reviewing this section in order to avoid any risk in future that they do not meet any of the standards for prescribing, for example C.3, which states that programmes must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Cardiff University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time
Date submission received	04 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15156-H1N9B1

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:

Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Paul Bates	Paramedic
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09094

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
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement 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 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Cardiff University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	09 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15157-J4V0Q1

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Julie-Anne Lowe	Occupational therapist
Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 79
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09095

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
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement 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 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Cardiff University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging, Full time
Date submission received	03 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15161-V0N6F5

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.

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:

Valerie Maehle	Physiotherapist
Stephen Boynes	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 90
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09099

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
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the Expression of Interest for professional head role, the Tier 2 Role descriptions and the proposed academic management structure documents. The visitors noted in the mapping document that the programme has a professional head who has appropriate programme management experience and is registered on the relevant part of the Register. The visitors considered from the documentation review that the professional head appeared to be the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. However they also noted that the programme has a programme manager who may also be responsible for managing the programme. The visitors considered that there is lack of clarity around the individual(s) responsible for managing the programme. The visitors could not see the

specific roles of the professional head or the programme manager and as such could not ascertain the education provider's criteria for determining their suitability for managing the programme. The visitors therefore require that the education provider provides further evidence that clarifies the role of the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme and their process for ensuring the suitability of the individual(s) to undertake the role.

Suggested evidence: Further clarification around the role of the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme and the education provider's process for determining their suitability.

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 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

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

From their review of the documentation, in particular the Internal Quality Document Programme Enhancement Plan 2019/20, the visitors noted the feedback from learners showed a 50% overall satisfaction in the programme's organisation and management. The visitors considered that this is a rather low level of satisfaction shown by the learners and would suggest that the education provider addresses this. The visitors also noted the reduction in overall satisfaction in assessment and feedback from 73% in 2018 to 63% in 2019. The visitors suggest that these feedback should be reviewed when the programme goes through its next annual monitoring audit.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Keele University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging), Full time
Date submission received	06 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15611-Y7M0J1

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:

Valerie Maehle	Physiotherapist
Stephen Boynes	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09192

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
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement 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 29 January 2020 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	Keele University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy, Full time accelerated MSci Physiotherapy, Full time MSci Physiotherapy (with International year), Full time
Date submission received	09 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15612-H6L8B2

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Stephen Boynes	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Valerie Maehle	Physiotherapist
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Accelerated)
Mode of study	FTA (Full time accelerated)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09194

Programme name	MSci Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2019

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09195

Programme name	MSci Physiotherapy (with International year)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09196

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	Documentation is not available for MSci Physiotherapy and MSci Physiotherapy (with International year) as the first cohort commenced in September 2019. Documentation is not available for MSc Physiotherapy (Accelerated) as the first cohort does not commence until January 2020.
External examiner reports from the last two year	No	As above
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	As above
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	As above

Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	As above
--	----	----------

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 29 January 2020 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	Liverpool John Moores University
Name of programme(s)	Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology, Full time Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology, Part time
Date submission received	22 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-13831-G6R6M8

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.....	6

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:

Antony Ward	Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist
Joanne Lusher	Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Health psychologist
First intake	01 April 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 7
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07775

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist

Modality	Health psychologist
First intake	01 April 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 7
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07776

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	Only one year's internal quality reports received as programme has run from April 2017.
External examiner reports from the last two years	No	Only one year's external examiners reports received as programme has run from April 2017.
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	Only one year's responses to external examiners reports received as programme has run from April 2017.
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	Only one year's practice-based learning monitoring received as programme has run from April 2017.
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	Only one year's service user and carer monitoring received as programme has run from April 2017.

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our

standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

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

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

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider stated in their mapping document that the programme will require applicants to have a placement set up prior to their application on to the programme. They also stated in the commentary document that entrants to the programme would have to provide evidence that they have a suitable role, placement or work related portfolio prior to their acceptance onto the programme. Whilst the visitors understood that it is the responsibility of individual applicants to ensure they have practice-based learning available prior to starting the programme, they were unclear about how the education provider supports learners if such anticipated practice-based learning opportunities fail to materialise. The visitors also could not identify any evidence that demonstrates how the education provider assesses practice-based learning as being adequate. The visitors considered that the information provided did not fully demonstrate that the education provider has an effective process in place for ensuring availability and capacity of practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require further evidence which demonstrates there is an effective process for ensuring availability and capacity of practice-based learning to all learners.

Suggested evidence: Information about how the education provider supports learners if anticipated practice-based learning opportunities are not available or are inadequate.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence for this standard, including a monitoring of service user involvement document. In their evidence, the education provider, using a table, illustrated how service users are involved in the programme and how their involvement is monitored. The information provided contained initials of individual learners, their year group, mode of study and a yes/no column for service user involvement. The visitors considered the information provided was not sufficient to demonstrate service user and carer involvement and they were unclear if there had been any changes implemented as a result of the user feedback. If there had been any changes, the visitors could not see from the evidence provided, what the changes were. As such, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which demonstrates service users and carers' involvement, including changes that have been implemented as a result of user feedback, if any.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: As evidence for this standard, the education provider referred the visitors to their commentary document which highlighted how learners are involved in the programme's quality assurance processes. The education provider also explained in the document how learners are able to raise issues at any time and how they get opportunities to meet with the external examiner to discuss issues that might affect their work. The visitors understood from this information some element of learners' involvement in the programme such as opportunities they have to provide feedback about their needs and interests as it relates to the programme. However, the visitors were unable to find information about how the education provider monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of learner involvement, to demonstrate how involving learners contributes to the quality, effectiveness and continuous improvement of the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information about how the education provider monitors and evaluates learner involvement to ensure it is used in a meaningful way.

Suggested evidence: Information, such as minutes of staff student committees or meetings, which demonstrates how the education provider monitors and evaluates learners' involvement and how this involvement is acted on.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: The education provider stated in their mapping and commentary document that there are appropriate mechanisms in place to afford opportunities for learners to raise concerns, including clear lines of reporting and whistleblowing procedures. The education provider also mentioned that their placement handbooks include lists of responsibilities of both the education provider and the learners themselves regarding raising concerns. The visitors noted that the placement handbooks or the sections referred to were not included in the submission for this annual monitoring audit and they were unable to identify further information elsewhere within the documentation that clearly articulates what effective process the education provider has in place to support learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors therefore require additional evidence that demonstrates there is an effective process to support learners in raising concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence that demonstrates the process the education provider has in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about service users' safety and wellbeing.

4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the visitors were made aware expectations of professional behaviour and the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) are built into the module learning outcomes and embedded within the assessments. However, the visitors did not see evidence of this and of how the learning outcomes ensure learners understand and are able to meet the expectations associated with being a registered professional. As this is a new standard, the visitors need to see

evidence of how this standard is met. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to provide information on how professional conduct and in particular the SCPEs are taught throughout the programme.

Suggested evidence: Information on how learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Reason: As part of the expanded evidence required for this audit, the education provider is required to demonstrate how they monitor practice-based learning. The education provider stated they had made no changes to how the programme continued to meet this standard. The visitors reviewed the monitoring of practice-based learning documents to consider whether this standard continues to be met. The visitors noted that the documents contained templates of placements forms, supervisors' reports and a table that shows whether the initial placement form and report were completed for each learner or not. From their review, the visitors considered that the data provided in these templates did not sufficiently demonstrate the education provider had a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning. As the visitors were unable to identify further information elsewhere within the documentation that demonstrates this, they therefore require additional evidence that shows there is a thorough and effective system in place for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence demonstrating how evaluations are run and assessed in practice-based learning.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the visitors were made aware expectations of professional behaviour and the SCPEs are built into the module learning outcomes and embedded within the assessments. However, the visitors did not see evidence of this and of how learners are able to demonstrate that they understand the expectations associated with being a regulated professional by the time they complete the programme. As this is a new standard, the visitors need to see evidence of how this standard is met. Therefore, the visitors require more information about how assessment throughout the programme ensures learners are able to demonstrate they understand the expectations associated with being a regulated professional, including the SCPEs.

Suggested evidence: Information about how assessment ensures learners understand and are able to meet our standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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 29 January 2020 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	Liverpool John Moores University
Name of programme(s)	Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology, Full time Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology, Part time
Date submission received	22 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-13930-X3K9X1

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

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 6 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:

Stephen Smith	Practitioner psychologist - Sport and exercise psychologist
Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Sport and exercise psychologist
First intake	01 April 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 7
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07777

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist

Modality	Sport and exercise psychologist
First intake	01 April 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 7
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07778

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	Programme started April 2017 so documents only available for one year.
External examiner reports from the last two years	No	As above
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	As above
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	As above
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	As above

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider stated in their mapping document that the programme will require applicants to have a placement set up prior to their application on to the programme. They also stated in the commentary document that entrants to the programme would have to provide evidence that they have a suitable role, placement or work related portfolio prior to their acceptance onto the programme. Whilst the visitors understood that it is the responsibility of individual applicants to ensure they have practice-based learning available prior to starting the programme, they were unclear about how the education provider supports learners if such anticipated practice-based learning opportunities fail to materialise. The visitors also could not identify any evidence that demonstrates how the education provider assesses practice-based learning as being adequate. The visitors considered that the information provided did not fully demonstrate that the education provider has an effective process in place for ensuring availability and capacity of practice-based learning. The visitors therefore require further evidence which demonstrates there is an effective process for ensuring availability and capacity of practice-based learning to all learners.

Suggested evidence: Information about how the education provider supports learners if anticipated practice-based learning opportunities are not available or are inadequate.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence for this standard, including a monitoring of service user involvement document. In their evidence, the education provider, using a table, illustrated how service users are involved in the programme and how their involvement is monitored. The information provided contained initials of individual learners, their year group, mode of study and a yes/no column for service user involvement. The visitors considered the information provided was not sufficient to demonstrate service user and carer involvement and they were unclear if there had been any changes implemented as a result of the user feedback. If there had been any changes, the visitors could not see from the evidence provided, what the changes were. As such, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which demonstrates service users and carers' involvement, including changes that have been implemented as a result of user feedback, if any.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: As evidence for this standard, the education provider referred the visitors to their commentary document which highlighted how learners are involved in the programme's quality assurance processes. The education provider also explained in the document how learners are able to raise issues at any time and how they get opportunities to meet with the external examiner to discuss issues that might affect their

work. The visitors understood from this information some element of learners' involvement in the programme such as opportunities they have to provide feedback about their needs and interests as it relates to the programme. However, the visitors were unable to find information about how the education provider monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of learner involvement, to demonstrate how involving learners contributes to the quality, effectiveness and continuous improvement of the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information about how the education provider monitors and evaluates learner involvement to ensure it is used in a meaningful way.

Suggested evidence: Information, such as minutes of staff student committees or meetings, which demonstrates how the education provider monitors and evaluates learners' involvement and how this involvement is acted on.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: The education provider stated in their mapping and commentary document that there are appropriate mechanisms in place to afford opportunities for learners to raise concerns, including clear lines of reporting and whistleblowing procedures. The education provider also mentioned that their placement handbooks include lists of responsibilities of both the education provider and the learners themselves regarding raising concerns. The visitors noted that the placement handbooks or the sections referred to were not included in the submission for this annual monitoring audit and they were unable to identify further information elsewhere within the documentation that clearly articulates what effective process the education provider has in place to support learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors therefore require additional evidence that demonstrates there is an effective process to support learners in raising concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence that demonstrates the process the education provider has in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about service users' safety and wellbeing.

4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the visitors were made aware expectations of professional behaviour and the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) are built into the module learning outcomes and embedded within the assessments. However, the visitors did not see evidence of this and of how the learning outcomes ensure learners understand and are able to meet the expectations associated with being a registered professional. As this is a new standard, the visitors need to see evidence of how this standard is met. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to provide information on how professional conduct and in particular the SCPEs are taught throughout the programme.

Suggested evidence: Information on how learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Reason: As part of the expanded evidence required for this audit, the education provider is required to demonstrate how they monitor practice-based learning. The education provider stated they had made no changes to how the programme continued to meet this standard. The visitors reviewed the monitoring of practice-based learning documents to consider whether this standard continues to be met. The visitors noted that the documents contained templates of placements forms, supervisors' reports and a table that shows whether the initial placement form and report were completed for each learner or not. From their review, the visitors considered that the data provided in these templates did not sufficiently demonstrate the education provider had a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning. As the visitors were unable to identify further information elsewhere within the documentation that demonstrates this, they therefore require additional evidence that shows there is a thorough and effective system in place for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence demonstrating how evaluations are run and assessed in practice-based learning.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the visitors were made aware expectations of professional behaviour and the SCPEs are built into the module learning outcomes and embedded within the assessments. However, the visitors did not see evidence of this and of how learners are able to demonstrate that they understand the expectations associated with being a regulated professional by the time they complete the programme. As this is a new standard, the visitors need to see evidence of how this standard is met. Therefore, the visitors require more information about how assessment throughout the programme ensures learners are able to demonstrate they understand the expectations associated with being a regulated professional, including the SCPEs.

Suggested evidence: Information about how assessment ensures learners understand and are able to meet our standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

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

The visitors noted that the Board of Studies minutes indicate some learners are having difficulties securing further practice-based learning opportunities as they progress through the programme. Whilst the visitors are satisfied the issue is being managed appropriately at present and that the standards continue to be met at a threshold level, they note that the matter should be carefully monitored in future to minimise its impact to learners. Any subsequent review of the programme which indicates the issue around placement availability persists may mean further assurance is required that the programme is able to provide a suitable number and range of practice-based learning experiences, in keeping with the requirements of the standards.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Portsmouth
Name of programme(s)	Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology, Part time
Date submission received	27 September 2019
Case reference	CAS-13891-D3F1W4

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

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:

Gary Robinson	Practitioner psychologist - Sport and exercise psychologist
Stephen Smith	Practitioner psychologist - Sport and exercise psychologist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Sport and exercise psychologist
First intake	01 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 4
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07850

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	No internal quality document was completed for 2017/18, as the programme did not recruit in this year.
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	External examiner reports were completed for 2016/17 despite no students in this year.
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	External examiner responses were completed for 2016/17 despite no students in this year.
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	No information about monitoring of practice-based training was included. The education provider said during the first two years learners complete the taught phase of the programme. They progress to research and practice-based modules after successful completion of these taught components. The first cohort of students will progress onto this research and practice phase for the 2019 / 20 academic year.
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	Only one year's worth of information about monitoring of service user and carer involvement was included.

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: From the evidence provided, the visitors were made aware Chris Wagstaff is the person holding overall professional responsibility for this programme. The visitors were informed that any new recruitment of Sport and Exercise Psychology staff for the past five years has included in the person specification explicit reference to applicants possessing BPS accreditation and / or HCPC registration. However, the visitors did not see any person specification document. The visitors were not clear from the evidence provided as to how the education provider will ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register. Therefore, the visitors need further information how the education provider ensures that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of how the education provider ensures they appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programme. For example, a role profile, person specification, recruitment process, expression of interest process or other information which demonstrates how you ensure the individual is appropriate.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: From the evidence provided, the visitors were made aware the education provider holds weekly meetings for group supervision and practice-based learning. The visitors were not informed who these meetings were with and the purpose of these meetings. The visitors were also directed to a code of practice for work-based and placement learning which gave information about the principles of practice-based learning in academic studies. However, the visitors were unclear how the education provider ensures all learners have access to practice-based learning. The visitors need to see further evidence of how the education provider makes sure of this, so all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the processes that ensure all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs. For instance, information about formal agreements of placement numbers you have with practice partners; terms of reference for meetings where discussions about placement capacity take place; information about team responsibilities for placement allocation; and information about any consideration of the context of practice-based learning in your region.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From their review of the evidence provided, the visitors were made aware the programme has a learner-elected course representative, learners are able to engage with two surveys run by the Higher Education Academy (HEA), and that there is a student voice policy. However, the visitors were not clear what processes are in place which allow the course representative to contribute to the programme. For example, the visitors could not determine which groups and / or committees they are elected to and how this contributes to the programme. The visitors were also unclear how the programme receives and uses the feedback from both surveys. The visitors were also unclear how the programme incorporates learners' feedback given from the mechanisms described in the student voice policy. The visitors therefore require further information how the education provider ensures that learners are involved in the quality, effectiveness, and continuous improvement of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the education provider's processes that ensure learners are involved in the programme. For example, this could include information about the process which ensures learners contribute through governance arrangements; how they feed back on specific areas of the programme; processes which ensure you act on learner feedback; how you ensure good engagement with the National Student Survey and act on feedback; and information on how your processes allow for any learner representatives to contribute to the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 29 January 2020 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 submission received	09 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15670-T6J5B5

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
Richard Sykes	Hearing aid dispenser
John Archibald	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 learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09271

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
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement 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 29 January 2020 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)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography Full time
Date submission received	02 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15638-Q0G1G4

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:

Valerie Maehle	Physiotherapist
Stephen Boynes	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 1997
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09296

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
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: As evidence for this standard, the education provider referred the visitors to their course leader application process document. The visitors noted from their review that this document provides generic information around the education provider's process of appointing programme leaders across different programmes delivered by the education provider. The visitors could not identify how the education provider will ensure that the person appointed as the person with overall professional responsibility specifically for this programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and on the relevant part of the Register. As such, they require that the education provider submit further evidence that demonstrates how they would ensure the suitability of the

individual with overall professional responsibility for this particular programme before they can determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Further information that demonstrates how the education provider ensures the person holding overall professional responsibility specifically for this programme is appropriately qualified and experienced, and unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register. Examples could be role profile, person specification, job description, recruitment process, expression of interest process or any other information that demonstrates how the education provider ensures the appropriateness of the individual with overall professional responsibility for this 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 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of South Wales
Name of programme(s)	Supplementary Prescribing, Part time Independent Prescribing, Part time
Date submission received	04 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15719-C2N2H0

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
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 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:

Julie-Anne Lowe	Occupational therapist
Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09374

Programme name	Independent Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM09375

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
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement 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 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	29 November 2019
Case reference	CAS-15728-V5H5T2

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:

Paul Bates	Paramedic
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM09392

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
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement 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 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Worcester
Name of programme(s)	FdSc Paramedic Science, Full time FdSc Paramedic Science (Tech to Para), Full time
Date submission received	09 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15231-L4P1J6

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:

Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Paul Bates	Paramedic
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	FdSc Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09396

Programme name	FdSc Paramedic Science (Tech to Para)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2015

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 135
Intakes per year	4
Assessment reference	AM09398

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	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	We received evidence of practice-based learning monitoring for one year only.
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	We received evidence of service user and carer involvement for one year only.

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 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Worcester
Name of programme(s)	V300 Non-Medical (Independent and Supplementary) Prescribing Programme, Part time
Date submission received	29 November 2019
Case reference	CAS-15232-R9S4K0

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:

Julie-Anne Lowe	Occupational therapist
Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	V300 Non-Medical (Independent and Supplementary) Prescribing Programme
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 February 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM09397

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
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement 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 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Worcester
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	29 November 2019
Case reference	CAS-15233-M1H6C6

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:

Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Paul Bates	Paramedic
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 120
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09399

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
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement 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 29 January 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).