

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Bournemouth University
Programme title	FdSc Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist) David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	9 April 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago

The education provider was unable to produce the response to external examiner's report for two years ago due to staffing issues.

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: The visitors noted in the response to the external examiner report for 2013-14 that the education provider is in the process of designing a BSc (Hons) paramedic Programme starting in the 2015-16 academic year. In addition the visitors also noted that throughout the submission there are concerns about the learning and staffing resources available for students on this programme. Considering the current concerns about student resources and the introduction of a new three year programme, the visitors require information about the impact the new BSc (Hons) programme will have on this programmes place in the education provider's business plan.

Suggested documentation: Documentation clearly indicating how the education provider will ensure that this programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan alongside the proposed new BSc (Hons) programme.

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

Reason: Throughout the submission the visitors noted that there were issues raised regarding learning resources available to students, this includes teaching staff and physical learning resources. These issues were raised by the programme leader and current staff in the framework leader's report. Specifically the framework leaders report for 2013-14 stated that "staffing resources has been raised throughout the year by students". In addition the 2013-14 programme leader report stated that "Teaching resources remained an issue as well as a discrepancy in feedback during OSCE practice", the visitors identified these as major concerns which have been reported in monitoring documents. Similar issued were raised in the external examiners report, however in the response to the 2013-14 external examiners report this problem is acknowledged the issue as it was stated that the education provider has "struggled with staffing resources but have advertised for a full time lecturer". The visitors were unconvinced that this was sufficient action due to the nature of the issues being raised and therefore the evaluation mechanisms in place were not effectively resolving issues raised. Therefore the visitors request further evidence demonstrating how the education provider's monitoring and evaluation systems enable actions to be taken on issues raised.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate how actions are taken on issues that are raised in the programmes monitoring and evaluation systems.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2
Section five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jane Grant (Occupational therapist) Kathryn Thirlaway (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	1 April 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Excerpt from course handbook re attendance
 - School of Health Sciences merger document
 - Mandatory Training and Testing Appendix

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From a review of the academic board proposal the visitors noted that the previous School of Health Professions (SHP) and the school of Nursing and Midwifery (SNM) have merged from January 2014 to form the new School of Health Sciences (SHS). The BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy has therefore moved from SHP to SHS. Whilst the proposal states the overarching changes for the schools, the visitors were unable to locate any information specific to the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgement on how the merger directly affects this programme. The visitors require further information on how the new merger has impacted the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy to ensure that it continues to ensure that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Suggested Documentation: A statement from the education provider to confirm the future of this programme within the new school.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the merger proposal document makes reference to the possibilities of site relocation. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that any such changes should be raised to the HCPC through the major change process.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2
Section five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	PG Dip Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jane Grant (Occupational therapist) Kathryn Thirlaway (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	1 April 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- School of Health Sciences merger document
- Mandatory Training and Testing Appendix

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From a review of the academic board proposal the visitors noted that the previous School of Health Professions (SHP) and the school of Nursing and Midwifery (SNM) have merged from January 2014 to form the new School of Health Sciences (SHS). The (Pre-registration) has therefore moved from SHP to SHS. Whilst the proposal states the overarching changes for the schools, the visitors were unable to locate any information specific to the PG Dip Occupational Therapy. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgement on how the merger directly effects this programme. The visitors require further information on how the new merger has impacted the Postgraduate Diploma in occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) to ensure that it continues to ensure that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Suggested Documentation: A statement from the education provider to confirm the secure place of occupational therapy within the new school.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the merger proposal document makes reference to the possibilities of site relocation. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that any such changes should be raised to the HCPC through the major change process.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Validating body	Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich
Programme title	Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Calum Delaney (Speech and language therapist) Linda Mutema (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Assessment of practice tools
 - Minor modification document

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitor report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor	2
Section five: Visitor comments.....	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Chester
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Tracy Clephan (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Overview of Resources
 - The British Dietetic Association Programme Accreditation
 - Terms of Reference Dietetics Programmes Partnership

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitor must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitor agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Section five: Visitor comments

In the internal annual monitoring report for years 2013 – 14 it stated that “Recruitment to 2 vacancies plus one new post is well underway”. The visitor noted that this statement was unclear and was therefore unsure how many members of staff have been recruited or were in the process of recruiting. The visitor would like to remind that education provider that a change to the number of staff on the programme should be flagged in the SETs mapping document. In future annual monitoring audits, a change like this should be flagged in the SETs mapping document to make the current number of staff on the programme clear.

Annual monitoring visitor report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor	2
Section five: Visitor comments.....	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Chester
Programme title	Pg Dip Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Tracy Clephan (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Overview of Resources
 - The British Dietetics Association Programme Accreditation

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitor agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Section five: Visitor comments

The visitor noted in the internal annual monitoring report for years 2013 – 14 that is stated that there were numerous vacancies and delays in recruitment and staff sickness which had impacted on the student experience, there was minimal information about the progress of current recruitment. The visitor was unable to identify any changes to the staff on the programme from the overview of resources document provided. The visitor would like to remind that education provider that in future annual monitoring audits a change like this should be flagged in the SETs mapping document to make the current number of staff on the programme team clear.

Annual monitoring visitor report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2
Section five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Chester
Programme title	MSc Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Tracy Clephan (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Overview of Resources
 - The British Dietetics Association Programme Accreditation

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitor agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitor agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitor agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Section five: Visitor comments

The visitor noted in the internal annual monitoring report for years 2013 – 14 that is stated that there were numerous vacancies and delays in recruitment and staff sickness which had impacted on the student experience, there was minimal information about the progress of current recruitment. The visitor was unable to identify any changes to the staff on the programme from the overview of resources document provided. The visitor would like to remind that education provider that in future annual monitoring audits a change like this should be flagged in the SETs mapping document to make the current number of staff on the programme team clear.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2
Section five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	De Montfort University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Audiology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	9 April 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - The education provider did not submit the external examiner report for academic year 2012–13 and the response to this report.

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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

Reason: The education provider did not submit the external examiner report for academic year 2012–13 and the response to this report. The education provider did submit an explanation suggesting the external examiner at the time failed to submit their report and sufficient arrangements were made to ensure there was ongoing external monitoring of the programme. However, the visitor did not see the details of these arrangements. Therefore, the visitor could not determine if there were monitoring and evaluation systems in place for this programme for academic year 2012–13. The visitor will need further evidence to show how this programme continues to meet this standard.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the monitoring and evaluation systems in place. For example external examiner reports and the education provider's responses to these reports.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitor noted that the responses to external examiner reports were submitted together for BSc (Hons) Audiology, BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology) and this programme. The visitors suggest that the education provider ensures they submit external examiner reports and responses to these reports specifically for each programme in future annual monitoring audits.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2
Section five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	De Montfort University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	9 April 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- The education provider did not submit the external examiner report for academic year 2012–13 and the response to this report.

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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

Reason: The education provider did not submit the external examiner report for academic year 2012–13 and the response to this report. The education provider did submit an explanation that the external examiner at the time failed to submit their report and sufficient arrangements were made to ensure there was ongoing external monitoring of the programme. However, the visitor did not see the details of these arrangements. Therefore, the visitor could not determine if there were monitoring and evaluation systems in place for this programme for the 2012-13 academic year. The visitor will need further evidence to show how this programme continues to meet this standard.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the monitoring and evaluation systems in place. For example external examiner reports and the education provider's responses to these reports.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitor noted that the responses to external examiner reports were submitted together for BSc (Hons) Audiology, BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology) and this programme. The visitors suggest that the education provider ensures they submit external examiner reports and responses to these reports specifically for each programme in future annual monitoring audits.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2
Section five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	De Montfort University
Programme title	Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	9 April 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - The education provider did not submit the external examiner report for academic year 2013–14 and the response to this report.

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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

Reason: The education provider did not submit the external examiner report for academic year 2013–14 and the response to this report. The education provider did submit an explanation that the external examiner at the time failed to submit their report and sufficient arrangements were made to ensure there was ongoing external monitoring of the programme. However, the visitor did not see the details of these arrangements. Therefore, the visitor could not determine if there were monitoring and evaluation systems in place for this programme for the 2013-14 academic year. The visitor will need further evidence to show how this programme continues to meet this standard.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the monitoring and evaluation systems in place. For example external examiner reports and the education provider's responses to these reports.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitor noted that the responses to external examiner reports were submitted together for BSc (Hons) Audiology, BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology) and this programme. The visitors suggest that the education provider ensures they submit external examiner reports and responses to these reports specifically for each programme in future annual monitoring audits.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Exeter
Programme title	Educational, Child and Community Psychology (D.Ed.Psy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Radiographer) Trevor Holme (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Greenwich
Validating body	Canterbury Christ Church University and University of Greenwich
Programme title	Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Calum Delaney (Speech and language therapist) Linda Mutema (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Assessment of practice tools
 - Minor modification document

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Institute of Biomedical Science
Programme title	Certificate of Competence (Non-accredited degree followed by Registration Training Portfolio)
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ann Green (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	1 April 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Education and Professional Standards Committee minutes
 - Committee paper for accreditation of postgraduate certificate and diploma qualifications
 - Example External Verifier reports
 - Guidance for External Verification of the Registration Portfolio
 - The education provider indicated on their HCPC audit form that there were external examiner reports and responses submitted. The HCPC visitors could not find these documents in the evidence provided.

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the submission which included examples of external verifier reports, guidance on the external verification process, and sets of Education and Professional Standards Committee minutes. The visitors noted within the Guidance for External Verification document that the education provider appoints an external verifier "...as its representative", to verify evidence provided by candidates and consider suitability of pre-registration training settings. From the evidence, the visitors could not see how the external verifier role or other systems in place provided external, independent review of the programme. The visitors also noted statements in the Education and Professional Standards Committee minutes that indicated there were some issues experienced in reviewing the verifier reports, for example, 25 January 2013: "Sample external verifier reports were received by Committee for information as part of the HCPC audit requirement. Committee were asked to send in any comments via email as members not had managed to review the reports prior to the meeting.", and 26 April 2013: "Some reports were noted to have minimal or no comments." The visitors could therefore not see evidence that effective monitoring and evaluation was taking place through this system. As such, in order for this standard to continue to be met the visitors require evidence to demonstrate that there are effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place, to include external review and response.

Suggested documentation: Information on how the programme gathers and responds to external review of the programme, independent of the education provider.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors reviewed examples of external verifier reports, guidance on the external verification process, and sets of Education and Professional Standards Committee minutes. As stated for SET 3.3, the visitors noted within the Guidance on the External Verification document that the education provider appoints an external verifier "...as its representative", to verify evidence provided by candidates and consider suitability of pre-registration training settings. From the evidence, the visitors could not see how the external verifier role provided an external and independent review of the programme. The Committee minutes from 17 July 2014 noted, "...concern over the requirements imposed by the HCPC requiring external examiners for approved programmes to be HCPC registered", that had been raised at a Heads of University Centres of Biomedical Sciences

(HUCBMS) Executive Committee meeting. The visitors could not see any further information on this concern, or any actions taken. The visitors could therefore not see evidence that there was an appropriately experienced and qualified external examiner appointed for the programme, who was from the appropriate part of the Register (unless other arrangements are agreed), or that the assessment regulations specify this requirement.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that assessment regulations specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Institute of Biomedical Science
Programme title	Certificate of Competence (Degree followed by Registration Training Portfolio)
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ann Green (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	1 April 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Education and Professional Standards Committee minutes
 - Example University Monitoring reports
 - Example University Accreditation reports
 - Example External Verifier reports
 - Guidance for External Verification of the Registration Portfolio
 - The education provider indicated on their HCPC audit form that there were external examiner reports and responses submitted. The HCPC visitors could not find these documents in the evidence provided.

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the submission which included examples of external verifier reports, guidance on the external verification process, and sets of Education and Professional Standards Committee minutes. The visitors noted within the Guidance for External Verification document that the education provider appoints an external verifier "...as its representative", to verify evidence provided by candidates and consider suitability of pre-registration training settings. From the evidence, the visitors could not see how the external verifier role or other systems in place provided external, independent review of the programme. The visitors also noted statements in the Education and Professional Standards Committee minutes that indicated there were some issues experienced in reviewing the verifier reports, for example, 25 January 2013: "Sample external verifier reports were received by Committee for information as part of the HCPC audit requirement. Committee were asked to send in any comments via email as members not had managed to review the reports prior to the meeting.", and 26 April 2013: "Some reports were noted to have minimal or no comments." The visitors could therefore not see evidence that effective monitoring and evaluation was taking place through this system. As such, in order for this standard to continue to be met the visitors require evidence to demonstrate that there are effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place, to include external review and response.

Suggested documentation: Information on how the programme gathers and responds to external review of the programme, independent of the education provider.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors reviewed examples of external verifier reports, guidance on the external verification process, and sets of Education and Professional Standards Committee minutes. As stated for SET 3.3, the visitors noted within the Guidance on the External Verification document that the education provider appoints an external verifier "...as its representative", to verify evidence provided by candidates and consider suitability of pre-registration training settings. From the evidence, the visitors could not see how the external verifier role provided an external and independent review of the programme. The Committee minutes from 17 July 2014 noted, "...concern over the requirements imposed by the HCPC requiring external examiners for approved programmes to be HCPC registered", that had been raised at a Heads of University Centres of Biomedical Sciences

(HUCBMS) Executive Committee meeting. The visitors could not see any further information on this concern, or any actions taken. The visitors could therefore not see evidence that there was an appropriately experienced and qualified external examiner appointed for the programme, who was from the appropriate part of the Register (unless other arrangements are agreed), or that the assessment regulations specify this requirement.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that assessment regulations specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Institute of Biomedical Science
Programme title	Certificate of Competence (Degree containing the Registration Training Portfolio)
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ann Green (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	1 April 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Education and Professional Standards Committee minutes
 - Example University Monitoring reports
 - Example University Accreditation reports
 - Example External Verifier reports
 - Guidance for External Verification of the Registration Portfolio
 - The education provider indicated on their HCPC audit form that there were external examiner reports and responses submitted. The HCPC visitors could not find these documents in the evidence provided.

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the submission which included examples of external verifier reports, guidance on the external verification process, and sets of Education and Professional Standards Committee minutes. The visitors noted within the Guidance for External Verification document that the education provider appoints an external verifier "...as its representative", to verify evidence provided by candidates and consider suitability of pre-registration training settings. From the evidence, the visitors could not see how the external verifier role or other systems in place provided external, independent review of the programme. The visitors also noted statements in the Education and Professional Standards Committee minutes that indicated there were some issues experienced in reviewing the verifier reports, for example, 25 January 2013: "Sample external verifier reports were received by Committee for information as part of the HCPC audit requirement. Committee were asked to send in any comments via email as members not had managed to review the reports prior to the meeting.", and 26 April 2013: "Some reports were noted to have minimal or no comments." The visitors could therefore not see evidence that effective monitoring and evaluation was taking place through this system. As such, in order for this standard to continue to be met the visitors require evidence to demonstrate that there are effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place, to include external review and response.

Suggested documentation: Information on how the programme gathers and responds to external review of the programme, independent of the education provider.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors reviewed examples of external verifier reports, guidance on the external verification process, and sets of Education and Professional Standards Committee minutes. As stated for SET 3.3, the visitors noted within the Guidance on the External Verification document that the education provider appoints an external verifier "...as its representative", to verify evidence provided by candidates and consider suitability of pre-registration training settings. From the evidence, the visitors could not see how the external verifier role provided an external and independent review of the programme. The Committee minutes from 17 July 2014 noted, "...concern over the requirements imposed by the HCPC requiring external examiners for approved programmes to be HCPC registered", that had been raised at a Heads of University Centres of Biomedical Sciences

(HUCBMS) Executive Committee meeting. The visitors could not see any further information on this concern, or any actions taken. The visitors could therefore not see evidence that there was an appropriately experienced and qualified external examiner appointed for the programme, who was from the appropriate part of the Register (unless other arrangements are agreed), or that the assessment regulations specify this requirement.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that assessment regulations specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who is appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Lancaster
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DCclinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychology
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Stephen Davies (Practitioner psychologist) Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External examiner's report for two years ago

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Newcastle University
Programme title	Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Radiographer) Trevor Holme (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Newcastle University
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychology
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Stephen Davies (Practitioner psychologist) Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External examiner's report for two years ago
- Quality Assurance and Enhancement Framework for Research Degree Programmes report from visit in June 2013
- Copy of the course response to the above visit
- Quality Assurance and Enhancement Framework for Research Degree Programmes annual review of research programmes for 2013/14
- Response to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Framework for Research Degree Programmes annual review of research programmes for 2013/14

- Quality Assurance and Enhancement Framework for Research Degree Programmes annual review of research programmes for 2014/15
- Response to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Framework for Research Degree Programmes annual review of research programmes for 2014/15
- Postgraduate research experience survey was undertaken in 2013. We developed an action plan in relation to this survey, copy included.
- Clearing House entry for the Newcastle course
- Newcastle University website advice to applicants
- Clearing house provided data on ethnicity, gender and age that we use in our reviews
- Board of studies terms of reference
- Programme handbook for the most recent year
- Proposal to alter the PPD assessment
- Response to the HCPC following the visit in 2012
- Proposal to alter Service Delivery assessment
- Permission to share information form
- Procedure to share information between the University and Trust.

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Queen's University of Belfast
Programme title	Doctorate in Educational, Child and Adolescent Psychology (DECAP)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Radiographer) Trevor Holme (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Calum Delaney (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Vince Clarke (Paramedic) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	St George's, University of London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Calum Delaney (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Undergraduate Year plan 2012–13
 - Undergraduate Year plan 2015–16
 - Major Change Notification Form, Confirmation Letter and Decision Notice
 - Undergraduate Module Directory and Practice Education DR 2008
 - Undergraduate Module Directory and Practice Education 2013

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	St George's, University of London
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing Health Professions Council (HPC) Members Level 6
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Vince Clarke (Paramedic) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- Validation document

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards for prescribing for all prescribers.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards for prescribing for education providers listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	St George's, University of London
Programme title	Foundation Science Degree in Paramedic Science (Gibraltar)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Vince Clarke (Paramedic) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- The Gibraltar cohort did not run in 2013 – 14 but the visitors reviewed relevant documentation from the Foundation Science Degree in Paramedic Science

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	St George's, University of London
Programme title	Foundation Science Degree in Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Vince Clarke (Paramedic) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Nicola Baker
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sheffield
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychology
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Stephen Davies (Practitioner psychologist) Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External examiner's report for two years ago
 - Annual Reflection Report 2012 & 2013
 - Annual Feedback Report 2013 & 2014
 - Annual Placement Report 2013 & 2014

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sheffield
Programme title	Doctor of Educational and Child Psychology (DEdCPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Radiographer) Trevor Holme (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2
Section five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sheffield
Programme title	MMED Sci Clinical Communication Studies
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Calum Delaney (Speech and language therapist) Linda Mutema (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Curriculum vitae for Dianne Webster
 - Curriculum vitae for Patricia Cowell
 - Mandatory Pre-Placement Training Student Handbook
 - Sheffield Small Talk Student Handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The education provider highlighted a programme leader change as part of this audit submission. The visitors were satisfied that the change to programme leader ensures the programmes continues to meet the standards of education and training. However, the visitors highlighted that changes to the programme leader should be addressed through the major change process and would like to remind the education provider that any future changes to the programme leader should be highlighted through the major change process.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2
Section five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sheffield
Programme title	B.Med Sci (Hons) Speech
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Calum Delaney (Speech and language therapist) Linda Mutema (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Curriculum vitae for Dianne Webster
 - Curriculum vitae for Patricia Cowell
 - Mandatory Pre-Placement Training Student Handbook
 - Sheffield Small Talk Student Handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The education provider highlighted a programme leader change as part of this audit submission. The visitors were satisfied that the change to programme leader ensures the programmes continues to meet the standards of education and training. However, the visitors highlighted that changes to the programme leader should be addressed through the major change process and would like to remind the education provider that any future changes to the programme leader should be highlighted through the major change process.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	2 April 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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

Reason: In their reading of the documentation provided regarding Inter professional learning, the visitors could not determine what assessment methods were being employed for the module. The visitors would therefore like to see further evidence that clearly demonstrates how the module will be assessed to ensure that the learning outcomes are achieved.

Suggested documentation: Revised documentation that clearly evidences the assessment methods employed to measure the learning outcomes for inter professional learning.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Swansea University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Stephen Davies (Practitioner psychologist) Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Curriculum vitae for the clinical facilitator
 - Module Pro Forma for revised modules:
 - Extract of Minutes of CQC 13.11.13 & 7.7.14

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Swansea University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Audiology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Stephen Davies (Practitioner psychologist) Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External examiner's report for two years ago

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University College London
Programme title	D.Ed.Psy Educational and Child Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Radiographer) Trevor Holme (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Supervisors handbook 2014 –15
 - BPS accreditation through partnership handbook 2013
 - Practice placement partnership framework with proposed amendments
 - Curriculum development 16–25 PBL booklet and PowerPoint presentation
 - Trainee feedback

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University Campus Suffolk
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Calum Delaney (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Student Handbook 2014–15

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East London
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology (D.Ed.Ch.Psych)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Radiographer) Trevor Holme (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	20 May 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Module PY8 101 handbook
 - Module PY8 102 handbook
 - Supervisors handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jane Grant (Occupational therapist) Kathryn Thirlaway (Health psychologist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	1 April 2015

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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

Reason: From a review of the Annual Monitoring Programme Report 2012–13 the visitors noted feedback from students which stated “No evidence on the website re the writing up fee”. The visitors note that this suggests a possible change to the programme in the way of introducing a writing up fee, or removing this information from the website. The visitors were not provided with any supporting documentation to inform them of any changes in this area and were therefore unable to confirm that this standard continues to be met. Any changes to the admission procedure such as the introduction of a writing up fee will need to be communicated to potential applicants and students of this programme. The visitors consider this to be essential information and therefore require further documentation to evidence how potential applicants are made aware of the writing up fee to ensure they have the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

Suggested Documentation: Updated admissions information and confirmation of any changes made in this area.

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

Reason: From a review of Annual Monitoring Programme Record 2012–13 the visitors noted a statement on page one, “The Health Behaviour Change Interventions module has been redesigned and is currently running for the first time with students from the 2012 cohort who will finish this module in January 2014.” The visitors were not provided any additional evidence to support this change and were therefore unable to make a judgement on how if the learning outcomes continue to ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for health psychologists. The visitors therefore require further information on the changes made to the Health Behaviour Change Interventions module, to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

Suggested Documentation: Updated module descriptor for The Health Behaviour Change Interventions module.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.