

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Name of programme(s)	Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing (level 7), Part time Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing (level 7) (SP only), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing (level 6), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing (level 6) (SP only), Part time
Date submission received	08 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15500-H0Q8Q6

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Pradeep Agrawal	Biomedical scientist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing (level 7)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	4
Assessment reference	AM09056

Programme name	Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing (level 7) (SP only)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	4
Assessment reference	AM09057

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (level 6)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	4
Assessment reference	AM09058

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (level 6) (SP only)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	4
Assessment reference	AM09060

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.

### **E.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:** The visitors were aware from the mapping document that the education provider had reviewed their assessment strategy to ensure that learners demonstrate ability to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the HCPC SCPEs. However, the education provider had not provided a narrative to give more evidence or detail about these changes, so the visitors were not able to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show what changes the education provider has made during the review of its assessment strategy in order to meet this standard.

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

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 02 July 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	Anglia Ruskin University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	07 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15501-L1C6T3

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

David Houlston	Biomedical scientist
Jason Comber	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 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 100
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09059

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
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 01 July 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	Anglia Ruskin University
Name of programme(s)	Diploma Higher Education Paramedic Studies, Full time
Date submission received	12 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15515-P7Q0Z9

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

David Houlston	Biomedical scientist
Jason Comber	Paramedic
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Diploma Higher Education Paramedic Studies
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 January 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 55
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	AM09062

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
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 01 July 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	Anglia Ruskin University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time
Date submission received	01 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15516-G0J6V3

### 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:

Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Luke Ewart	Operating department practitioner
Rabie Sultan	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 August 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 55
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09063

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	No	External examiner (EE) report is only for 2018/19. Programme did not have a level 5 until 2018/19 and EEs at the education provider do not assess at level 4.
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	Response to external examiner (EE) report is only for 2018/19. Programme did not have a level 5 until 2018/19 and EEs at the education provider do not assess at level 4.
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 their evidence for this standard, the education provider provided a document that highlighted the roles and responsibilities of the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme. However, the visitors noted that the education provider did not demonstrate their process for determining the person's suitability. This standard requires education providers to show that they have an appropriate and effective process of identifying a suitable person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As this was not provided anywhere within the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that the education provider has a process for ensuring that the persons appointed to have overall professional responsibility for the programme are appropriate. The education provider could consider providing evidence such as person specification, expression of interest or their recruitment and selection policy to demonstrate how recruitment to the role would be undertaken.

## 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 02 July 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	Aston University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, Full time
Date submission received	02 December 2019
Case reference	CAS-15396-R8D8M6

### 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:

Sara C Smith	Biomedical scientist
David Houlston	Biomedical scientist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 October 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09066

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.

#### **2.5 The admissions process must ensure that applicants are aware of and comply with any health requirements.**

**Reason:** The education provider flagged in their mapping document that there had been a change in the way they met this standard, namely a new process for ensuring that all learners have an occupational health check. The document directed the visitors to page 3 of Appendix 1, Applied BMS Application Procedure. However, it was not clear to the visitors from this what the new procedure would be, or how it would work. Additionally the visitors were not able to see how the information about the new process

would be communicated to learners, and to employers. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require further evidence.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to clarify the new process for ensuring that all learners have an occupational health check, and to clarify how the new process will be communicated to learners and employer partners.

### **3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.**

**Reason:** The education provider stated that there had not been any change in the way they meet this standard. However, from their review of documentation, specifically meeting minutes, the visitors noted that access to practice-based learning remained an issue for the programme. They further noted from the annual report that the number of learners wishing to undertake a placement year was in decline. They therefore considered that they needed more evidence about how the education provider was addressing threats to the sustainability of the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how the education provider is addressing the possible threats to the sustainability of the programme noted above.

### **3.5 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.**

**Reason:** The education provider did not flag any changes to the way in which they meet this standard. There are regular meetings between the education provider and practice partners. However, from their review of documentation, the visitors did note that these meetings were not always well-attended, and that this might affect the effectiveness of the collaboration. They considered therefore that they could not determine at this point whether the standard was met, and would like to see further evidence of how, in the 2017-18 and 2018-19 academic years, the education provider ensured that these meetings were effective.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show that the meetings between the education provider and practice partners continued to represent effective collaboration and that absences from such meetings did not have ill-effects on such collaboration.

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

### **5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.**

The additional evidence request below is relevant to each of the standards above.

**Reason:** In evidence for this standard, the education provider cited the programme handbook, which explained to learners the different routes through the programme and the place of practice-based learning within it. The education provider aims to meet this standard by only admitting learners who have already secured practice-based learning. The visitors understood the structure of the programme, but considered that the evidence submitted did not address how the education provider would ensure that all practice-based learning would meet learning needs. Additionally, the visitors were not

clear how the education provider would ensure that the work-based learning available to learners on placement would support learners and meet their learning needs. For example, no evidence was provided around how the education provider monitored who was supporting learners in the workplace. They considered that this was linked to the additional evidence request under SET 3.5 above, addressing the apparent lack of liaison between the education provider and practice partners. The visitors also noted that, linked to this lack of clarity about the education provider-practice educator relationship, it was not clear in the evidence how the education provider would monitor the training status of practice educators.

They were therefore unable to determine whether these standards were met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how the education provider ensures that the practice-based learning brought on to the programme by learners is appropriate to meet learning needs.

### **3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.**

**Reason:** The education provider indicated in their mapping document that they had recruited additional staff. The visitors could not see in the evidence provided what the teaching responsibilities of these additional staff were. It was not clear which modules were the responsibility of which individuals. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether this standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show the teaching responsibilities of the newly recruited staff members.

## **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 01 July 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 Bath
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology, Full time
Date submission received	05 March 2020
Case reference	CAS-15397-T0L9P3

### Contents

<b>Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Section 2: Programme details .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Section 4: Outcome from first review .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....</b>	<b>4</b>

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Kenneth Street	Paramedic
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 14
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09072

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

#### **3.17 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:** In their mapping document and within the submission, the education provider highlighted that the HCPC guidance on conduct and ethics for learners is covered in the induction teaching and learners are informed of their professional responsibility to report concerns about safety of service users. However, the visitors were unable to identify information that clearly articulates how this will be done in practice. The visitors considered that the evidence submitted did not provide explicit information that directs

learners to the policy they would need to follow in situations where they think the safety and wellbeing of service users may have been compromised. As such, the visitors could not be sure that the education provider's process for supporting and enabling learners in raising of concerns was effective. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating how learners are supported in raising concerns in practice.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that shows how learners are made aware of the practical steps they need to follow to raise concerns about the safety and well-being of service users.

## 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 02 July 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 University of Bolton
Name of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing IP and/or SP (HE6), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing IP and/or SP (HE7), Part time
Date submission received	23 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15519-K8D1T6

### 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:

Karen Diamond	Arts therapist - Music therapist
James Pickard	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Independent prescriber)
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing IP and/or SP (HE6)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM09080

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

First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM09081

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 02 July 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)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy), Full time
Date submission received	12 March 2020
Case reference	CAS-15153-B0N4L6

### 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:

Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Kenneth Street	Paramedic
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09091

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

#### **3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.**

**Reason:** As part of the expanded evidence base required for this audit, the education provider is required to demonstrate how they monitor service users and carers' involvement over the last two academic years. The visitors noted that the education provider provided several documents that showed how service users and carers are involved in the programme. However, there was no evidence demonstrating how their involvement is being monitored on a regular basis. As such, the visitors could not be certain that the education provider had an effective system in place for ensuring that

service users and carers' involvement contributes to the quality of the programme. The visitors therefore require that this be evidenced before they can determine whether this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating the programme has regular and effective systems in place for monitoring service users and carers' involvement.

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

**Reason:** The education provider directed the visitors to their Quality Enhancement Committee (QUEC) minutes amongst other documents as part of their evidence for this standard. The visitors noted that the minutes as well as the other evidence provided showed how staff members provide updates on how practice-based learning is being delivered across the different providers. However, the visitors did not see any information that demonstrates the education provider has a formal process for ensuring availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners. As such, the visitors request that the education provider further demonstrate their process of ensuring both current and future learners on the programme will continue to have access to practice-based learning, which meets their learning needs.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of the process in place to guarantee the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

### **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 document that learners are professionally bound to operate within, and are protected by the education provider and practice education providers' whistleblowing policies. They also highlighted that there is a support structure in place to enable learners in raising concerns about the wellbeing of service users. However, the visitors were not provided with any evidence that demonstrates how learners are made aware of the formal process they will need to follow to raise concerns. All through their review, the visitors could not locate information within the documentation that directs learners to the policy they would need to follow in situations where they think the safety and wellbeing of service users may have been compromised. As such, the visitors could not be sure that the education provider's process for supporting and enabling learners in raising of concerns was effective. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating how learners are supported in raising concerns in practice.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that shows how learners are made aware of the practical steps they need to follow to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

### **4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.**

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed several documents including the programme handbook and several examples provided on how learners on the programme learn with, and from other professionals and learners, including nurses, foster carers, and charity representatives. The visitors noted from the examples provided that learners could get

opportunities of interprofessional education (IPE). However, the education provider did not provide the visitors with a coherent strategy of how interprofessional education is being delivered on the programme. The visitors could not see any formal structure that the education provider had in place to ensure interprofessional education is strategically embedded within the curriculum. As such, they could not determine that this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Additional evidence demonstrating the education provider's formal structure for delivering IPE on the programme.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 02 July 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	City, University of London
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Health Psychology (Dpsych), Part time Doctorate in Health Psychology (Dpsych), Full time
Date submission received	01 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15528-R3Z3X5

### 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:

Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist
Joanne Lusher	Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Health Psychology (Dpsych)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Health psychologist
First intake	01 January 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 11
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09102

Programme name	Doctorate in Health Psychology (Dpsych)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist

Modality	Health psychologist
First intake	01 January 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 11
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09104

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	No	External examiners did not raise any concerns about the programme, and so the programme considered there was no need to respond.
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes	
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The programme does not have a taught component that includes service users. All teaching elements take place in the first year and the last cohort began in 2016.

### 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.

#### **3.17 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:** To evidence this standard, the education provider said learners receive a one-day ethics workshop at the beginning of their training which discusses how to recognise and report concerns regarding service users. The visitors were made aware of the slides from this workshop. However, the visitors did not see any evidence of the policy or process learners would use if they wanted to raise a concern when they believe the safety or wellbeing of service users is at risk. The visitors therefore need to see evidence of the process for learners to recognise situations where service users may be at risk, which supports them in raising any concerns and which makes sure action is taken in response to those concerns.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider needs to provide further evidence of the process for learners to recognise situations where service users may be at risk, which supports them in raising any concerns and which makes sure action is taken in response to those concerns.

#### **4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.**

**Reason:** To meet this standard, the education provider supplied a narrative explaining that trainees have the opportunity to attend workshops, seminars and talks with learners from other health disciplines. The visitors were also informed learners have work placements within multidisciplinary teams, where they have opportunities to learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions. However, the education provider did not provide any evidence of this and the visitors therefore could not be sure how learners learn with and from other relevant professionals and learners. The visitors require evidence of how learners learn with and from other relevant professionals and learners.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider needs to provide evidence of how learners learn with and from other relevant professionals and learners.

### **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 02 July 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 Royal Central School of Speech and Drama
Validating body	University of London
Name of programme(s)	MA Drama and Movement Therapy, FT (Full time)
Date submission received	06 February 2020
Case reference	CAS-15554-M3M7F4

### Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach .....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation.....	5
Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s) .....	5

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Belinda Sherlock	Arts therapist - Dramatherapist
Martin Benwell	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Tracey Samuel-Smith	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA Drama and Movement Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Dramatherapist
First intake	01 October 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 22
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09124

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

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

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

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

**3.17 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:** In the mapping document, the visitors were directed to appendices 11 (programme specification 2018-2020), 12 (programme specification 2017 – 2019) and 20 (placement learning handbook 1920). Within appendix 20, the visitors noted under

the section 'Host Organisation' that the placement host has a responsibility for '... health and safety on placement, and should brief the student on relevant health and safety procedures...'. In appendices 11 and 12, the visitors noted the therapy requirements of learners which included individual therapy and group dramatherapy. In addition, they noted that at practice-based learning, learners would '... spend the first week in an induction, going through procedures with your supervisor...'. However, the visitors could not identify the specific guidance provided to learners so they understood their responsibilities or could identify situations where service users may be at risk. In addition, the visitors were unclear how the education provider supported learners in raising concerns, including who learners should raise concerns to, and how they ensured action was undertaken in response to any concerns raised. As this is a new standard, the visitors therefore require additional evidence to demonstrate this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must submit evidence which demonstrates how they:

- ensure learners recognise situations where service users may be at risk;
- support learners in raising any concerns; and
- ensure action is undertaken in response to any concerns raised.

#### **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 the mapping document, the visitors were directed to specific pages within appendices 11 (programme specification 2018-2020), 12 (programme specification 2017 – 2019) and 20 (placement learning handbook 1920). Within these appendices, the visitors noted the references to the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for Arts therapists (drama). However, they were unable to identify how, through the course of the programme, learners had the opportunity to learn about professional conduct and demonstrate an understanding of which types of behaviour are appropriate for a professional and which are not. In addition, the visitors could not identify any reference to the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. As this is a new standard, the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate how this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must submit evidence which demonstrates how they ensure learners understand, and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

#### **4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.**

**Reason:** In the mapping document, the visitors were directed to a range of appendices. From this documentation, it was clear to the visitors how learners learnt with, and from, learners from other relevant professions during the Performing research unit and within practice-based learning. However, the visitors were unclear about how learners learnt with, and from, professionals in other relevant professions. From appendices 11 (programme specification 2018-2020) and 12 (programme specification 2017 – 2019), the visitors noted the module specification for the Performing research unit. Within this, the visitors identified that unit leaders are from across 'All MA/MFA programmes (except MAs Acting, Music Theatre and Acting for Screen)'. The visitors were unclear which

programmes, and therefore professions, this applied to and which unit leaders teach during this module. The visitors were therefore unclear about how learners are prepared to work with other professionals and across professionals for the benefit of service users and carers. In addition, the visitors noted within the mapping document, the education provider referenced appendix 37. Unfortunately the visitors were unable to locate this appendix and were unclear of the evidence type contained within this appendix. As this is a new standard, the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate how this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** The education must submit additional evidence which demonstrates how learners learn with, and from, professionals in other relevant professions.

## **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 the mapping document, the visitors were directed to specific pages within a range of appendices, including appendices 11 (programme specification 2018-2020), 12 (programme specification 2017 – 2019) and 20 (placement learning handbook 1920). Within these appendices, the visitors noted the references to the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for Arts therapists (drama). However, they were unable to identify how, through the course of the programme, learners had the opportunity to demonstrate they understand the expectations associated with being a regulated professional by the time they complete the programme. In addition, the visitors could not identify any reference to the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. As this is a new standard, the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate how this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must submit evidence which demonstrates how the assessment throughout the programme ensure learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the 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 01 July 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 reviewing the further evidence submitted as requested under section 4, the visitors noted that there is still no explicit mention of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) within the documentation. Though the visitors were satisfied that standards continue to be met at threshold level, but they noted reference is made to the standards of proficiency (SOPs) within the documentation where it should have been SCPEs ideally. Therefore, the visitors would like to suggest if documentation could be revised accordingly to reflect accurate wordings making reference to the SCPEs where needed.

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Edinburgh
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol), Full time Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol), Flexible
Date submission received	15 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15169-Y8F1H3

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Kenneth Street	Paramedic
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 1995
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09129

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist

Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09130

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
HCPG 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.

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

**Reason:** The education provider referred the visitors to their Service Level Agreement between NHS Education for Scotland (NES) and NHS Boards as their evidence for this standard. The visitors noted that this document is blank. The visitors also noted from their review that availability and capacity of practice-based learning appeared to be managed by individual NHS Boards. The visitors considered that the education provider had not sufficiently demonstrated how they ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning, given their overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors request that the education provider further demonstrate how they ensure both current and future learners on the programme will continue to have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence that shows the education provider's process of ensuring availability and capacity of practice-based learning across all practice education providers.

### **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:** In their mapping document, the education provider highlighted that learners are taught about the HCPC Standards of conduct and ethics for learners in the initial weeks of teaching. They also stated that all placements take place in NHS Boards, which are required to have whistleblowing policies. The education provider referred the visitors to an example of a whistleblowing policy for one of the NHS Boards. The visitors could see the process that learners would need to follow to raise concerns. However, they could not find any information that shows how learners are directed to this process. As such, the visitors could not be sure that the education provider's process for supporting and enabling learners in raising of concerns was effective. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating how learners are supported in raising concerns in practice.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that shows how learners are made aware of the practical steps they need to follow to raise concerns about the safety and well-being of service users.

### **4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.**

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with clinical practice handbook and academic handbook amongst other documents, as evidence for this standard. From their review, the visitors could see how the programme delivers interprofessional education (IPE) within practice-based learning. However, the visitors were unable to identify the education provider's overall strategy for ensuring interprofessional education is being delivered both in practice-based and non-practice-based settings. The visitors could not be assured that learners would still be able to learn with, and from professionals and learners outside of practice-based learning. As such, they could not determine that this standard is met. The visitors therefore require additional evidence that shows learners have access to IPE opportunities in all settings.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of the education provider's overall strategy to interprofessional education.

## 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 02 July 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	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging, Full time
Date submission received	12 March 2020
Case reference	CAS-15557-Q6B4Y3

### 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:

Sasha Hall	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
Stephen Boynes	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 68
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09154

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	Yes	
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The education provider has no formal monitoring process for service user and carer involvement in the programme.

### 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:** To evidence this standard the education highlighted the generic school and definitive programme document. The definitive programme document was not submitted for the assessment so the visitors were unable to review it. Upon reviewing the generic school document the visitors could see an outline of the management structure of the school and the activities that the programme lead would carry out. The visitors were unable to determine from this information how the education provider was ensuring that the programme lead was sufficiently qualified and experienced or on the relevant part of the register. Furthermore, they could not see how the education provider would ensure this should a replacement be required.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how the education provider ensures 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.

### **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 that evidence that could be found in the Practice Placement Agreement (PPA)/ Practice Based Learning Placement Agreement (PrBLPA), Department Annual Audit and QSPP documents. These documents were not provided in the submission for the visitors. Therefore the visitors were unable to make an evidence based judgement that this standard was met. The education provider must submit further evidence to show the processes in place to make sure that all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show there is an effective process in place to ensure the availability of practice-based learning for all learners.

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

**Reason:** The education provider did not submit evidence of monitoring of service user and carer involvement, and in the audit form stated that there is currently no formal monitoring process for service user and carer involvement in the programme. While the visitors could see some involvement in the teaching on the programme for service users and carers this standard also is to understand the processes in place to plan, monitor and evaluate service user and carer involvement. The visitors could not see how the standard was met in these areas. The education provider must show how they monitor and evaluate service users and carers' involvement in the programme to ensure they are contributing to the overall quality and effectiveness of a programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of how the education provider monitors the involvement of service users and carers to ensure they are contributing to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

### **3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.**

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the education provider stated that evidence that could be found in Definitive Programme Document. This document was not provided in the submission for the visitors. Therefore the visitors were unable to make an evidence based judgement that this standard was met. The education provider must provide further

evidence to show how the experience of learners is central to the quality and effectiveness of the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show learners are involved in the programme in a meaningful way.

## 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 02 July 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	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	06 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15558-Z0Z3N0

### 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:

Jo Jackson	Physiotherapist
Helen Catherine White	Dietitian
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 66
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09155

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	Although internal quality document for last year has been included, the education provider stated that this is currently pending approval by the Programme Board and is subject to changes based on the Board's feedback and approval.
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	Education provider stated that responses to external examiners for two years ago have not been included because formal written response processes have only been implemented since last year.
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes	
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The education provider stated that monitoring of service user and carer involvement have not been included because the involvement of service users and carers within modules have not changed from the past year.

### 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 01 July 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	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, Full time
Date submission received	31 March 2020
Case reference	CAS-15559-V2Y3Z0

### 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:

Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Pradeep Agrawal	Biomedical scientist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09156

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:** The education provider supplied the visitors with information about the current programme leader. This person was appropriate for the role. However, the visitors were not supplied with evidence relating to the process for appointing a new programme leader if it becomes necessary to do so, as required under the amended standard, and so they were unable to determine whether the standard was met. For SET 3.3 education providers must demonstrate that they have suitable procedures in place to appoint a new programme leader, for example job descriptions, person specifications, information about succession planning, or a narrative of the recruitment process.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence showing that the education provider had appoint a suitable new programme lead if it becomes necessary to do so.

### **3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.**

**Reason:** The education provider submitted minutes of the programme board, alongside responses to questionnaires and National Student Survey (NSS) results. This appeared to be suitable evidence insofar as it went. However, the visitors were not clear how the feedback loop from this learner involvement was closed, i.e. how the input from them was used to drive continuous improvement on the programme. They were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require the education provider to submit evidence demonstrating how feedback is used.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how feedback from learners is used to improve and develop the programme.

### **4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.**

**Reason:** In their evidence for this standard, the education provider submitted an Inter-Professional Education Survey for Nursing and Allied Health Professions students. The visitors considered that, while useful in some respects, this document did not make it clear how all learners were enabled to access inter-professional education, and in particular how they were enabled to learn with, and from, both learners and professionals in other relevant professions. They therefore require further evidence.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that all learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners.

## **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 01 July 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	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition and Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	21 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15560-J4V1R8

### 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:

Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Luke Ewart	Operating department practitioner
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 January 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09157

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	Yes	
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	Education provider stated that service user and carer involvement occurred during the audit period but the framework for monitoring was established in 2019.

### 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:** The visitors were supplied with the School of Health and Life Sciences Generic School Document as evidence for this standard. The visitors noted that the document provided the role description of a programme lead. However, there was no mention of the process the education provider would follow to determine their suitability. This standard requires education providers to show that they have an appropriate and effective process of identifying a suitable person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As this was not provided anywhere within the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that the education provider has a process for ensuring that the persons appointed to have overall professional responsibility for the programme are appropriate. The education provider could consider providing evidence such as person specification, expression of interest or their recruitment and selection policy to demonstrate how recruitment to the role would be undertaken.

## 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 02 July 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	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Dietetics, Full time MSc Dietetics, Part time
Date submission received	21 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15561-T3P3T1

### 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:

Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Luke Ewart	Operating department practitioner
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 December 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09158

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

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09159

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:** The visitors were supplied with the School of Health and Life Sciences Generic School Document as evidence for this standard. The visitors noted that the

document provided the role description of a programme lead. However, there was no mention of the process the education provider would follow to determine their suitability. This standard requires education providers to show that they have an appropriate and effective process of identifying a suitable person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As this was not provided anywhere within the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that the education provider has a process for ensuring that the persons appointed to have overall professional responsibility for the programme are appropriate. The education provider could consider providing evidence such as person specification, expression of interest or their recruitment and selection policy to demonstrate how recruitment to the role would be undertaken.

## 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 02 June 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	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	D.Psych in Counselling Psychology, Full time D.Psych in Counselling Psychology, Part time
Date submission received	17 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15565-L0D8W8

### 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:

Vikki Powell	Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist
Antony Ward	Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	D.Psych in Counselling Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09161

Programme name	D.Psych in Counselling Psychology
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist

Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09162

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 02 July 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	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing SCQF Level 10, Part time Non-Medical Prescribing SCQF Level 11, Part time Non-Medical Prescribing SCQF Level 9, Part time
Date submission received	08 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15568-Z8N4M8

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Alaster Rutherford	Independent Prescribing
Shola Apena Rogers	Practitioner psychologist Forensic psychologist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing SCQF Level 10
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM09163

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing SCQF Level 11
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM09164

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing SCQF Level 9
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM09165

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	Yes	

Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The education provider had referenced 'Strategy for Service User and Carer Focussed Public Involvement June 2016' document as evidence for this. However, the visitors could not see any information regarding the monitoring of service user and carer involvement from the last two years.
--	----	--

#### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### **Further evidence required**

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

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

#### **B.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.**

**Reason:** From reviewing the audit form submitted, the visitors noted the education provider had referenced the 'Strategy for Service User and Carer Focussed Public Involvement June 2016' document, as evidence for monitoring service user and carer involvement for the last two years. The visitors noted this document contained information such as the roles and functions of service users and carers, including the professional body requirements for their involvement. Upon reviewing this document, and all other documents submitted as part of this annual monitoring submission, the visitors could not find information regarding the monitoring of service user and carer involvement for the last two years to determine its effectiveness.

As per the requirements of the expanded evidence requirements from 2018-19, education providers are required to provide evidence relating to monitoring of service user and carer involvement for the last two years. As there was no evidence provided to demonstrate this, the visitors could not determine how the education provider monitors service user and carer involvement as part of the programme's monitoring and evaluation systems. The visitors were therefore unclear about how the education provider ensures the quality and effectiveness of service user and carer involvement. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate how they have monitored and evaluated service user and carer involvement for the last two years to ensure overall quality and effectiveness of their involvement in the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must provide evidence which demonstrates the monitoring of service user and carer involvement over the last two years to ensure quality and effectiveness of involvement.

**B.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:** From reviewing the mapping document, the visitors noted that learners need to inform the module leader, or a member of the programme team, if they have a concern about the safety and wellbeing of a service user. Without further evidence submitted for this standard, the visitors could not identify any information regarding the follow on steps carried out once the issue is raised with the module leader. As noted in the mapping document, the visitors recognised that learners can raise issues at their workplace by following their employer's policies. However, as per the requirement of this standard it is expected that the education provider will have a process in place to deal with any concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. Without reviewing a formal process, the visitors could not determine how this standard is met. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, including the follow on steps once a concern has been raised.

**Suggested evidence:** Documentation demonstrating the process for raising concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, including the follow on steps to deal with any concerns raised.

## 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 02 July 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	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	01 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15573-T7F0L4

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Patrick Armsby	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 1996
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 65
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09167

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 01 July 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.

In the standards mapping document the education provider indicated they are currently planning on enhancing the current placement request format. The changes will focus on becoming a more needs led directive process. This will allow for improved management in the periods of high demand. This is to support the reconfiguration of learner numbers and growing placement opportunities. The visitors considered that this information did not compromise the meeting of any standards. However, they considered that future assessments should consider how this new approach to practice-based learning affects any standards, if it is to be implemented.

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	05 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15579-C9R6W6

### 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:

Jo Jackson	Physiotherapist
Helen Catherine White	Dietitian
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 August 1997
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 78
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09169

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
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 01 July 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	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	BSc Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	28 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15589-W6P5R7

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

David Houlston	Biomedical scientist
Jason Comber	Paramedic
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09174

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
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 01 July 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	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	02 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-15590-M0K8N4

### 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:

Jo Jackson	Physiotherapist
Helen Catherine White	Dietitian
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09175

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	No	The education provider stated that responses to external examiners for two years ago have not been included because formal written response processes have only been implemented since last year.
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 01 July 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	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	CPD Cert Admin & Use of Orthoptic Exemptions, Part time
Date submission received	03 March 2020
Case reference	CAS-15591-T1X6X2

### 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 the use by orthoptists of exemptions to sell and supply medicines (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:

David Newsham	Orthoptist (with exemptions)
Helen Orton	Orthoptist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	CPD Cert Admin & Use of Orthoptic Exemptions
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Orthoptist exemptions
First intake	01 August 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	4
Assessment reference	AM09176

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
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 01 July 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	Glasgow Caledonian University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Orthoptics, Full time
Date submission received	03 March 2020
Case reference	CAS-15592-T0C5G2

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

David Newsham	Orthoptist (with exemptions)
Helen Orton	Orthoptist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Orthoptics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Orthoptist
Entitlement	Orthoptist exemptions
First intake	01 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09177

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
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 01 July 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 Glasgow
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy), Full time
Date submission received	15 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15607-L1N5G8

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Kenneth Street	Paramedic
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 1995
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 23
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09178

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

#### **3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.**

**Reason:** As part of the expanded evidence base required for this annual monitoring audit, the education provider is required to provide external examiner reports and responses to the reports for the last two academic years. The visitors noted that the education provider had not provided any response to the external examiner reports submitted.

The education provider stated on their audit form that feedback to external examiner report occurs through their examination board meetings and through the academic

governance paperwork. However, the visitors noted that the education provider had not provided minutes of those meetings or any academic governance paperwork. As such, the visitors could not determine that the education provider had a regular and effective monitoring system in place, particularly for carrying out external quality audits. The visitors therefore require that the education provider submit evidence of their response to the external examiner comments and feedback before they can determine whether this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of education provider's responses to all 2017-18 and 2018-19 external examiner reports.

### **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 referred the visitors to the University of Glasgow - Public Interest Disclosure Policy and handbook excerpt as their evidence for this standard. From their review, the visitors could see information around the education provider's fitness to practice procedure. However, they could not find explicit information about the process the education provider had in place to enable learners raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors also noted that the mapping document stated that the education provider has a public interest disclosure (whistleblowing) policy that "provides appropriate protections for people in the university community who raise concerns". However, the visitors were not referred to this policy and they could not locate it anywhere within the submission. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require that the education provider provide evidence of how learners are guided to the process they need to follow to raise concerns.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of the education provider's whistleblowing policy that shows how learners are supported and enabled to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

### **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.**

### **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:** The visitors noted from the evidence supplied that the education provider had provided information on how professional conduct and ethical practice are covered within the learning outcomes. However, they could not find information that demonstrates how the expectations of professional behaviour and standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) are measured on the programme. The visitors noted that the excerpts from the programme handbook referred to ethical awareness and self-management of learners professional functioning. However, the visitors could not identify specific information that shows how the expectations of professional behaviour as well as the SCPEs are delivered through the learning outcomes or how they are assessed. The visitors therefore request additional information that shows how expectations of professional behaviour and SCPEs are covered and assessed throughout the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Further details of how expectations of professional behaviour and the SCPEs are measured on the programme.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 02 July 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	Glyndwr University
Name of programme(s)	Prof Cert (Practice Certificate In Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for AHP's at level 7), Part time Professional Certificate (Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for AHPs at level 7), Part time Professional Certificate (Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for AHPs at level 6), Part time
Date submission received	05 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-15615-X5V4K6

### 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:

Karen Diamond	Arts therapist - Music therapist
James Pickard	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Independent prescriber)
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Prof Cert (Practice Certificate In Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for AHP's at level 7)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09180

Programme name	Professional Certificate (Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for AHPs at level 7)
----------------	--

Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 June 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09181

Programme name	Professional Certificate (Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for AHPs at level 6)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing
First intake	01 June 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09182

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
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 02 July 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	Goldsmiths, University of London
Name of programme(s)	MA Art Psychotherapy, Full time MA Art Psychotherapy, Part time
Date submission received	12 March 2020
Case reference	CAS-15174-P2V8N4

### 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:

Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist
Jed Jerwood	Arts therapist - Art therapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA Art Psychotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Art therapist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09183

Programme name	MA Art Psychotherapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Arts therapist

Modality	Art therapist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09184

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.

**3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.**

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

**Reason:** The visitors were made aware there had been staffing changes on the programme and within the School the programme sits. The visitors were informed that the programme is working with departmental management to review the staffing plan with a view to re-establishing the overall stability of the team. The visitors were made aware a number of staff have taken temporary career breaks or reduced their work which has been managed by redistributing the roles and work within the team and employing replacement posts on fixed term basis. The visitors were also made aware of comments from the external examiner of major organisational and management challenges.

The visitors considered that taking these changes into account they were unclear how the programme and programme team was being supported from senior management at the education provider. Therefore, the visitors require further information of how the programme team are being supported, and also information to ensure there is an appropriate number of staff able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how the programme team are being supported, and also information to ensure there is an appropriate number of staff able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively.

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

**Reason:** To meet this standard, the visitors were informed service users and carers are integrated in teaching and programme development and that service user involvement will be highlighted at a stakeholder meeting. However, the visitors considered that from the information supplied by the education provider that ongoing engagement to be somewhat limited. Therefore, the visitors need further evidence to indicate how service users and carers are being involved in the programme, how recruitment is being addressed, and how service users will be trained and supported to contribute to the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence indicating how service users and carers are being involved in the programme, how recruitment is being addressed, and how service users will be trained and supported to contribute to the programme.

### **4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.**

**Reason:** To meet this standard, the visitors were informed working with other professionals on placement is identified as a learning outcome and is assessed on placement. They were also made aware learners have a lecture from a psychiatrist as well as sessions with dance movement psychotherapy learners. However, the visitors considered there was limited evidence of involvement of a range of relevant professions. The visitors also considered the evidence indicated no involvement from professions outside of arts and other therapies. The visitors therefore require further information about how learners undertake interprofessional education (IPE) on the programme. The visitors want to know how the programme has made decisions about designing and delivering IPE, including the professions most relevant to the programme and most useful in preparing learners for practice, so it has the most benefit possible for learners' future professional practice and for service users and carers.

**Suggested evidence:** Further information about how learners undertake IPE on the programme. How the education provider has made decisions about the design and delivering of IPE, including the professions most relevant to the programme and most useful in preparing learners for practice.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 02 July 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	Guildhall School of Music and Drama
Name of programme(s)	MA Music Therapy, Guildhall School of Music and Drama, Full time
Date submission received	26 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15593-C0Y2Q3

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

James Pickard	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Independent prescriber)
Karen Diamond	Arts therapist - Music therapist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA Music Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Music therapy
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09185

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

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

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

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
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 02 July 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)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, Full time
Date submission received	07 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15608-C7P8B0

### 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:

Jason Comber	Paramedic
David Houlston	Biomedical scientist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM09189

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
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 01 July 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)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (with international year), Full time
Date submission received	12 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15610-K0F8T2

### 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:

Jo Jackson	Physiotherapist
Helen Catherine White	Dietitian
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 October 1996
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 80
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09191

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (with international year)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 August 2018

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 80
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09193

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 01 July 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	London Ambulance Service NHS Trust
Name of programme(s)	Paramedic Programme, Work based learning
Date submission received	22 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15617-P9H4P4

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

David Houliston	Biomedical scientist
Jason Comber	Paramedic
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Paramedic Programme
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 October 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 18
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	AM09197

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
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 01 July 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	Leeds Beckett University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	04 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15620-V5C8Y2

### 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:

Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1995
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 33
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09201

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
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 01 July 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	Leeds Beckett University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time Pg Dip Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	07 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15626-R5Z6V9

### 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:

Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09204

Programme name	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 March 2011

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 16
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09206

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 01 July 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	Leeds Beckett University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time Pg Dip Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	04 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15644-L6W9W2

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:

Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 February 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09205

Programme name	Pg Dip Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2011

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09207

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 01 July 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 Plymouth
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Dietetics Full time
Date submission received	29 January 2020
Case reference	CAS-15188-C0S2Q0

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Luke Ewart	Operating department practitioner
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 February 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09259

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:** From the evidence provided for this standard, the visitors were able to see the roles and responsibilities of the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme. However, the visitors noted that the education provider did not demonstrate their process for determining the person's suitability. This standard requires education providers to show that they have an appropriate and effective process of identifying a suitable person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As this was not provided anywhere within the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that the education provider has a process for ensuring that the persons appointed to have overall professional

responsibility for the programme are appropriate. The education provider could consider providing evidence such as person specification, expression of interest or their recruitment and selection policy to demonstrate how recruitment to the role would be undertaken.

**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.**

**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:** For these standards, the visitors reviewed the evidence submitted, including the placement handbook and the programme specification. The visitors noted that the documents made references to how the learning outcomes deliver “national and local standards.” However, it was unclear to the visitors how HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) are covered during the programme. For instance, the visitors were unable to identify any information that showed how placement learning outcomes were aligned to the SCPEs. It was also unclear to the visitors how the module learning outcomes are taught and assessed to ensure the SCPEs are covered throughout the programme. As such, the visitors could not determine that these standards were met. The visitors therefore require that the education provider to further demonstrate how the learning outcomes and assessments ensure learners are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that at all levels of the programme, learners are enabled to understand and meet the HCPC SCPEs and that assessment of their ability to meet expectations of professional behaviour is clearly aligned to the SCPEs.

## 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 02 July 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)	BSc (Hons) Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	02 March 2020
Case reference	CAS-15671-B4Z8T5

### 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:

Pauline Douglas	Dietitian
Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 October 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09272

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
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 02 July 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)	MSc Dietetics, Full time MSc Dietetics, Part time PgDip Dietetics, Full time PgDip Dietetics, Part time
Date submission received	03 March 2020
Case reference	CAS-15697-R4D9Q3

### 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 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:

Helen Catherine White	Dietitian
Julie Leaper	Dietitian
John Archibald	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09279

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

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09280

Programme name	PgDip Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09282

Programme name	PgDip Dietetics
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09283

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 02 July 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 saw that the annual monitoring reports for the last two years both state there have been issues with many last minute timetabling changes. This was due to staffing issues and there was concern for staff workload and vacancies which had not yet been filled for the start of the 2019 academic year. The visitors considered that as this was a recurring theme this should be highlighted for future assessments.

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Queen Margaret University
Name of programme(s)	MSc (pre registration) in Speech and Language Therapy, Full time MSc (pre registration) in Speech and Language Therapy, Part time Post Graduate Diploma (pre-registration) in Speech and Language Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	28 February 2020
Case reference	CAS-15703-T3T2B5

### 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).....	5

### Executive Summary

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

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

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

Rebecca Khanna	Occupational therapist
Lorna Povey	Speech and language therapist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc (pre registration) in Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 August 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09288

Programme name	MSc (pre registration) in Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 August 2010

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09289

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma (pre-registration) in Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 August 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09292

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:** In the evidence submitted the visitors could not see evidence that the education provider had an appropriate process for appointing a new programme leader if it became necessary for them to do so. There was information relating to general management cited in the mapping document, but nothing to show how they would ensure the appointment of a suitable person, as required by the standard. The visitors were therefore not able to be sure that the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of the specific process for appointing a suitable person to the role of programme leader, if it becomes necessary to do so.

**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:** In the evidence submitted the visitors could see that the education provider had a process in place for learners to raise concerns, and that learners were appropriately prepared to recognise what might constitute a safeguarding problem in the professional context. However, they also considered that it was not made sufficiently clear to learners that they would not be penalised if they raised concerns in any part of the programme, and so they could not be sure that the process to support and enable the raising of concerns was effective.

Additionally, the visitors considered the process detailed in the evidence incomplete because it did not appear to help learners to recognise the kind of situations in which service users may be at risk, in the specific context of occupational therapy.

For these reasons the visitors could not determine that the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show

- how learners are reassured that they will not be penalised if they raise concerns, especially in the practice-based learning context; and
- how learners are enabled to recognise situations where they may need to raise concerns.

## 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 02 July 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, with regard to SET 4.2, that although the content of the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) was appropriately integrated into the programme, and that therefore the standard was met at threshold, in some places there was a lack of explicit linking of the material taught to the SCPEs. They considered that this might create a risk in future that learners would not understand clearly the importance of the SCPEs, and so the standard would not be met. They therefore suggest that the education provider keep this under review.

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	18 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15194-D8Q2R1

### 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:

Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09325

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
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 01 July 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	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Radiotherapy and Oncology in Practice, Full time
Date submission received	05 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15196-L6Y1B3

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Beverley Ball	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Jane Day	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Radiotherapy and Oncology in Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09328

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 01 July 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 Smae Institute
Name of programme(s)	Diploma in Local Anaesthesia for Podiatry Practice, Distance learning Diploma In Prescription Only Medicines for Podiatric Practice, Part time
Date submission received	15 May 2020
Case reference	CAS-15658-D8M1N8

### 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:

Wendy Smith	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration)
Emma Supple	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration, sale / supply)
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Diploma in Local Anaesthesia for Podiatry Practice
Mode of study	DL (Distance learning)
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – administration
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09331

Programme name	Diploma In Prescription Only Medicines for Podiatric Practice
----------------	---

Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09332

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 01 July 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 Strathclyde
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics, Full time
Date submission received	02 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-15715-S6H7D1

### 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:

Alasdair Gilbertson	Prosthetist / orthotist
Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Prosthetist / orthotist
First intake	01 January 1998
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09337

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
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 01 July 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	Teesside University
Name of programme(s)	Advancing from Supplementary to Independent Prescribing, Part time Advancing Non Medical Prescribing (postgraduate), Part time Non Medical Prescribing (undergraduate), Part time
Date submission received	06 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15210-B0S3Z3

### Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach .....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	5
Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s) .....	5

### Executive Summary

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

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards 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 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:

Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Pradeep Agrawal	Biomedical scientist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Advancing from Supplementary to Independent Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09348

Programme name	Advancing Non Medical Prescribing (postgraduate)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 130
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM09350

Programme name	Non Medical Prescribing (undergraduate)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM09351

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted	
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	Specific documentation for this evidence was not submitted but the education provider indicated evidence around this area could be found elsewhere in their submission.
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	Specific documentation for this evidence was not submitted but the education

	provider indicated evidence around this area could be found elsewhere in their submission.
--	--

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### **Further evidence required**

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

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

### **B.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 register of their statutory regulator.**

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the appendix 1, referred to under this standard in the mapping document, had not been included with the submission. They were therefore unable to make a decision about whether the information included in that appendix would have helped them understand how the programme meets the standards. The visitors were able to view a job description for the programme leader role, but it was not clear to them how the process for appointing a new suitable programme leader if it became necessary to do so, would work.

**Suggested evidence:** Appendix 1, and further evidence to demonstrate what process the education provider will use to ensure that if it becomes necessary to do so, an appropriate new programme leader can be appointed.

### **D.6 Practice educators must be a qualified prescriber, on the register of their statutory regulator with annotation(s) for prescribing where applicable and with the relevant skills, knowledge and experience to support safe and effective learning.**

**Reason:** The mapping document referred to a DMP handbook, which would help to show how the standard was met. This handbook was not included in the submission so the visitors were not able to make a decision about whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** The DMP handbook, or similar evidence to demonstrate how the standard is met.

## **E.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:** The visitors were aware from the mapping document that the education provider had reviewed their assessment strategy to ensure that learners demonstrate ability to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. However, the education provider had not provided a narrative to give more evidence or detail about these changes, so the visitors were not able to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show what changes the education provider has made during the review of its assessment strategy in order to meet this standard.

### Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 01 July 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 Non-Medical Prescribing: Module Guide and Portfolio document did not explicitly refer to the HCPC standards for conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). They did not think this affected the education provider's meeting the relevant standard as the material covered in the SCPEs was still included, but they considered that there could be a future risk of the standard not being met if learners were not aware of the specific links between the SCPEs and the programme content.

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Teesside University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Dietetics (Pre-Registration), Full time accelerated
Date submission received	27 February 2020
Case reference	CAS-15213-Z0D2J6

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Luke Ewart	Operating department practitioner
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Dietetics (Pre-Registration)
Mode of study	FTA (Full time accelerated)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09353

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	Evidence submitted for one year only as programme commenced in January 2019.
External examiner reports from the last two years	No	Evidence submitted for one year only as programme commenced in January 2019.
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	Evidence submitted for one year only as programme commenced in January 2019.
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	Evidence submitted for one year only as programme commenced in January 2019.
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	Evidence submitted for one year only as programme commenced in January 2019.

### 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:** The education provider did not provide any evidence to demonstrate how the programme meets this standard. The visitors noted that the mapping document stated the name of the current programme lead and when they became appointed. However, there was no mention of the process the education provider would follow to determine their suitability. This standard requires education providers to show that they have an appropriate and effective process of identifying a suitable person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As this was not provided anywhere within the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that the education provider has a process for ensuring that the persons appointed to have overall professional responsibility for the programme are appropriate. The information provided should demonstrate how they ensure this person is appropriately qualified and experienced to undertake the role. The education provider could consider providing evidence such as person specification, expression of interest or their recruitment and selection policy to demonstrate how recruitment to the role would be undertaken.

#### **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:** The education provider did not map this standard, neither did they provide any evidence to demonstrate how the programme meets the standard. In their review, the visitors noted a document that highlighted the titles of the modules. However, it was not clear to them from the evidence submitted how specifically the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) were covered throughout the programme, as required in this standard. The visitors therefore require further evidence relating to how the education provider ensures that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour including the SCPEs.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that at all levels of the programme learners are enabled to understand and meet the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

#### **4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.**

**Reason:** The education provider did not map this standard, neither did they provide any evidence to demonstrate how the programme meets the standard. The visitors noted from their review that there was no reference to how the programme delivers interprofessional education. As such, they could not determine that this standard was met. The visitors therefore request that the education provider demonstrate how they ensure learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that demonstrates how interprofessional education is being delivered on the programme.

### Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 02 July 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 Ulster
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging, Full time
Date submission received	03 March 2020
Case reference	CAS-15215-L6F6D3

### 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 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:

Sasha Hall	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
Stephen Boynes	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Patrick Armsby	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 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 48
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09356

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.

#### **3.17 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:** To evidence this standard the education provider highlighted sections of the practice educator handbook. In the academic visitors report form section of the handbook, the visitors could see that the academic visitors would ask the learner if they had any concerns about the safety and wellbeing of any service users. The visitors considered this approach suggested that learners would only have the opportunity to raise concerns about service users in line with the academic visit. The document did not say how the learner would know how to raise a concern at any other time in practice-based learning. Similarly, the student's perception of clinical placement section highlighted learners' opportunity to raise concerns about service users and carers after completing the practice section. The visitors considered that this approach could lead to concerns being raised or picked up too long after the incident has occurred. In some instances learners may need to raise a concern instantly, rather than waiting for the

academic visitor or the clinical placement review. The education provider did not highlight the process that would allow this or how learners were informed about it.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how learners are able to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users at any time in the programme and how this is communicated to learners.

## 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 02 July 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.

In responding to the additional evidence request the visitors could see that the education provider provides a presentation that is given to learners prior to practice-based learning. The visitors could see that there is a process for learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users and carers. However, they considered the way of communicating this to learners to be slightly informal. As such future assessments should consider how the education provider continues to communicate this process to learners to ensure they are appropriately informed.

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Ulster
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time
Date submission received	09 March 2020
Case reference	CAS-15223-D3L0H2

### 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:

Sharon Wiener-Ogilvie	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Jane Day	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Entitlement	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
First intake	01 June 1997
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09363

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

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

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

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>	<b>Reason(s) for non-submission</b>
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	The previous Course Director has been unable to provide this document as data was accidentally lost when their computer was upgraded by IT staff.
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	The previous Course Director has been unable to provide this document as data was accidentally lost when their computer was upgraded by IT staff.
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.

### **3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.**

**Reason:** In the podiatry JSSCC November 2019 meeting minutes there is discussion around the national survey of students' scores. It is stated that the degree is at risk if this result continues. This indicates there is a potential risk for the future of the programme. The education provider must show how they will mitigate these risks and show how they plan to ensure the future of the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how the education provider will ensure that the programme remains sustainable and fit for purpose.

### **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:** To evidence this standard the education provider submitted a course director specification that highlighted the educational and experiential requirements for the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors considered this to be appropriate for leading the programme. The specification also stated that the course director would be from one of the professional groups recognised by the HCPC and be appropriately qualified. However, they did not stipulate that the entire programme team will be made up of educators who are on the relevant part of the register. Furthermore, the HCPC does not recognise professional groups but rather ensures there is a live register of professionals who are fit to practice the profession. The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility is on the relevant part of the register or ensure other appropriate arrangements are in place.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme will be on the relevant part of the register or will have appropriate other arrangements in place.

### **3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.**

**Reason:** Within the audit form submitted by the education provider they have indicated that the response to the external examiner and monitoring of practice-based learning for the last two years have been lost from an individual's computer. The visitors considered that the current system has resulted in quality monitoring documents not being available and thus not feeding into the overall quality of the programme. The visitors considered that it being reliant on an individual could be prone to disruption should the individual be unavailable etc. The education provider must ensure that its systems for monitoring and evaluation are effective and ensure that information gathered is appropriately responded to.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show that the systems for monitoring and evaluating are effective to ensure the ongoing quality and effectiveness of the programme.

### **3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.**

**Reason:** The education provider has submitted documents that show minutes of meetings in which learner feedback is discussed. However, it is not clear how the education provider has actioned or responded to learner feedback. For example in the JSSCC November 2019 minutes, the national survey of students score is acknowledged and that this will be taken forward for discussion at the next staff committee meeting. The education provider has also indicated that they would feedback to learners that the scores could affect learner's chance of employment and how the quality of their degree is viewed. If the education provider is responding to learners by stating that their feedback could affect their employment the visitors considered that this could prevent learners from providing meaningful feedback. This issue has been raised as example among other issues that have been raised by learners. This standard is included to ensure that learners are involved in a meaningful way to develop or improve the programme and they are made aware of the actions that the education provider is taking as a result of their involvement. The education provider must show they are taking forward feedback that is meaningful. Furthermore, they must show how they are responding to learner's feedback, not limited to the examples above, to ensure learners are contributing to the quality, effectiveness and continuous improvement of the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show that learners there is meaningful involvement from learners to develop or improve the programme and that learners are aware of the actions the education provider has taken as result of their involvement.

### **4.6 The learning and teaching methods used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.**

**Reason:** In the minutes for the JSSCC November 2018 meeting it has been raised that some content is being delivered through YouTube video clips. This was raised as a concern by learners as they did not feel it was covering the content appropriate to being able to meet the learning outcomes. The visitors cannot make a judgment with the current documentation that the teaching methods are appropriate so the education provider must provide further information to show that the teaching methods in year 1 are appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show that teaching methods are appropriate to the effective deliver of the learning outcomes.

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

**Reason:** The education provider was unable to provide documents relating to the monitoring of practice –based learning over the last 2 years. As the documents were not available the visitors could not judge that this standard has been met. The education provider must show they have a through and effective system for ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

## 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 01 July 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.

In the submission the visitors noted low scores for the programme in the National Survey of Students (NSS) and concerns raised by learners. The education provider acknowledged this as an institution wide issue and provided a document that showed a University wide approach to improvement across all programmes. The visitors considered the education provider was reacting to the feedback and so considered the relevant standards to be met at a threshold level. However, the education provider indicated the amount of feedback received was a concern and the feedback could have an impact on the sustainability of the programme. Any future assessments of the programme should consider how the provider is ensuring meaningful learner involvement and feedback on the quality of the programme. It should also consider any changes made in light of learner feedback to ensure the standards continue to be met.

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Name of programme(s)	Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300), Part time Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300), Part time Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300) Level 7, Part time
Date submission received	11 June 2020
Case reference	CAS-15725-H6C6N4

### 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 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:

Karen Diamond	Arts therapist - Music therapist
James Pickard	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Independent prescriber)
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM09388

Programme name	Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09391

Programme name	Independent / Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (V300) Level 7
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing, Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM09415

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 02 July 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](#).