

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	City University
Programme title	Doctorate in Health Psychology (Dpsych)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist) Sabiha Azmi (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	22 April 2016

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
 - Programme handbook
 - Workplace provider 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.

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

Reason: The visitors were provided with periodic review documents for September 2014 and July 2015. The visitors were satisfied that the periodic review document could demonstrate effective monitoring and evaluation, however, there was no mention of this programme within these documents. The visitors note that other documentation was provided to support the education providers monitoring and evaluation on this programme. However they note that without seeing how this programme is included in the periodic review they cannot be certain that the programme continues to have effective regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place. In addition to this the visitors did not receive the annual programme evaluation for 2013-14. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how this programme is included in the periodic review to ensure that there continues to be effective regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Suggested documentation: Evidence which demonstrates that there are regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place such as documentation which outlines how this programme is included in the periodic review.

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	The Royal Central School of Speech and Drama
Programme title	MA Drama and Movement Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Dramatherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Tina Pyman (Dramatherapist) Dianna Gammage (Dramatherapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of postal review	29 June 2016

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
 - Course specification
 - The Royal Central School of Speech and Drama Single Equality Scheme
 - Staff evaluation
 - Practice placement handbook
 - Academic regulations handbook
 - Document on service user involvement

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	Keele University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	14 June 2016

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
 - Summary of changes
 - Module changes
 - Programme specification for students enrolling in September 2015
 - Programme specification for students enrolling from September 2016
 - Course regulations
 - New Staff CVs
 - Programme evaluation questionnaire
 - ABMS placement module (LSC30044) IPE information
 - Student IPE reflections

- HCPC new standard of proficiency mapping document
- New external examiner documentation

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.

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

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors noted a statement in appendix 1E saying that the education provider considered students and stakeholders as the service users for the programme. The visitors could not determine from this statement how the education provider had determined students and stakeholders as the service users and carers of a biomedical scientist and how their involvement contributed to the programme. As such the visitors did not have the evidence they required to determine how the programme team had a clear rationale as to why the service users and carers involved in the programme were determined to be the most appropriate people to be involved. For this reason the education provider is required to provide additional evidence to demonstrate how the education provider determined students and stakeholders as the service users for a biomedical scientist and how their involvement was considered appropriate for the programme. In addition the visitors could not determine how the service users and carers were recruited, trained and supported for their involvement.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the service users and carers were identified and how the programme team determined the appropriateness of their involvement. In addition evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are recruited, supported and trained.

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	London South Bank University
Programme title	BS (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne MacKay (Social worker in England) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of postal review	12 July 2016

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.

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

Reason: As part of the evidence provided the visitors reviewed the web link to an article which articulated that the education provider had implemented a new service user and carer group called the People's Academy. However, the statement was not specific about how the programme team have determined which service users have been chosen as the most appropriate people to be involved with this programme. The visitors were also unclear as to how the team had determined what involvement service users and carers have in this programme and what preparation the team had planned or undertaken to ensure the success of this involvement, including the training and support of service users and carers. Therefore the visitors did not have the evidence they require to be sure that this standard has been met by the programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence of the process the programme team followed to determine which service users are most appropriate to be involved in the programme, how they have determined the appropriateness of the involvement and how service users and carers will be trained and supported.

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	London South Bank University
Programme title	PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Mackay (Social worker in England) Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of postal review	16 June 2016

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
- A link to an article on the People's Academy at the London South Bank University

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.

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

Reason: As part of the evidence provided the visitors reviewed the web link to an article which articulated that the education provider had implemented a new service user and carer group called the People's Academy. However, the statement was not specific about how the programme team have determined which service users have been chosen as the most appropriate people to be involved with this programme. The visitors were also unclear as to how the team had determined what involvement service users and carers have in this programme and what preparation the team had planned or undertaken to ensure the success of this involvement, including the training and support of service users and carers. Therefore, the visitors did not have the evidence they require to be sure that this standard has been met by the programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence of the process the programme team followed to determine which service users are most appropriate to be involved in the programme, how they have determined the appropriateness of the involvement and how service users and carers will be trained and supported.

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	London South Bank University
Programme title	PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Mackay (Social worker in England) Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of postal review	16 June 2016

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
- A link to an article on the People's Academy at the London South Bank University

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.

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

Reason: As part of the evidence provided the visitors reviewed the web link to an article which articulated that the education provider had implemented a new service user and carer group called the People's Academy. However, the statement was not specific about how the programme team have determined which service users have been chosen as the most appropriate people to be involved with this programme. The visitors were also unclear as to how the team had determined what involvement service users and carers have in this programme and what preparation the team had planned or undertaken to ensure the success of this involvement, including the training and support of service users and carers. Therefore, the visitors did not have the evidence they require to be sure that this standard has been met by the programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence of the process the programme team followed to determine which service users are most appropriate to be involved in the programme, how they have determined the appropriateness of the involvement and how service users and carers will be trained and supported.

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	London South Bank University
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Mackay (Social worker in England) Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of postal review	16 June 2016

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
- A link to an article on the People's Academy at the London South Bank University

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.

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

Reason: As part of the evidence provided the visitors reviewed the web link to an article which articulated that the education provider had implemented a new service user and carer group called the People's Academy. However, the statement was not specific about how the programme team have determined which service users have been chosen as the most appropriate people to be involved with this programme. The visitors were also unclear as to how the team had determined what involvement service users and carers have in this programme and what preparation the team had planned or undertaken to ensure the success of this involvement including the training and support of service users and carers. Therefore the visitors did not have the evidence they require to be sure that this standard has been met by the programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence of the process the programme team followed to determine which service users are most appropriate to be involved in the programme, how they have determined the appropriateness of the involvement and how service users and carers will be trained and supported.

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	London South Bank University
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Mackay (Social worker in England) Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of postal review	16 June 2016

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
 - A link to an article on the People's Academy at the London South Bank University

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.

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

Reason: As part of the evidence provided the visitors reviewed the web link to an article which articulated that the education provider had implemented a new service user and carer group called the People's Academy. However, the statement was not specific about how the programme team have determined which service users have been chosen as the most appropriate people to be involved with this programme. The visitors were also unclear as to how the team had determined what involvement service users and carers have in this programme and what preparation the team had planned or undertaken to ensure the success of this involvement including the training and support of service users and carers. Therefore the visitors did not have the evidence they require to be sure that this standard has been met by the programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence of the process the programme team followed to determine which service users are most appropriate to be involved in the programme, how they have determined the appropriateness of the involvement and how service users and carers will be trained and supported.

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	Medway School Of Pharmacy
Name validating body	Universities of Greenwich and Kent
Programme title	Postgraduate Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Distance Learning
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosie Furner (Independent prescriber) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	14 June 2016

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 Business Plan
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Programme Team Structure
 - Programme Planning Board Terms of Reference
 - Definitive Programme Document
 - External examiners curriculum vitae

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.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has included service users and carers in the programme planning board. However, the visitors were unable to see how this involvement enabled service users and carers to contribute to the programme in an effective way. For example, the visitors were unable to see how the input from service users and carers was translated into overseeing and directing the management and delivery of the programme as intended by the programme planning board terms of reference. The documentation does make reference to further inclusion of service users and carers in the programme but did not highlight exactly what this involvement would be. Therefore the visitors were unclear how service users and carers are able to contribute to the programme in an effective way through the programme planning board, or by other means.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that service users and carers are able to contribute to the programme in an effective way. This could include the minutes and agreed priorities and actions of the programme planning board meetings, or, other ways in which service users and carers are involved in the programme.

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	Medway School Of Pharmacy
Name validating body	Universities of Greenwich and Kent
Programme title	Postgraduate Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Distance Learning
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosie Furner (Independent prescriber) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	14 June 2016

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 Business Plan
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Programme Team Structure
 - Programme Planning Board Terms of Reference
 - Definitive Programme Document
 - External examiners curriculum vitae

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.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has included service users and carers in the programme planning board. However, the visitors were unable to see how this involvement enabled service users and carers to contribute to the programme in an effective way. For example, the visitors were unable to see how the input from service users and carers was translated into overseeing and directing the management and delivery of the programme as intended by the programme planning board terms of reference. The documentation does make reference to further inclusion of service users and carers in the programme but did not highlight exactly what this involvement would be. Therefore the visitors were unclear how service users and carers are able to contribute to the programme in an effective way through the programme planning board, or by other means.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that service users and carers are able to contribute to the programme in an effective way. This could include the minutes and agreed priorities and actions of the programme planning board meetings, or, other ways in which service users and carers are involved in the programme.

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	University of Plymouth
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Clinical Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James McManus (Clinical psychologist) Lincoln Simmonds (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of postal review	30 June 2016

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
 - Academic actions plans
 - Clinical action plans
 - Placement audit
 - Supervisor minutes
 - Clinical module review
 - SRCCG minutes
 - DClinPsy APM minutes

- CBT Mapping
- Supervisor committee and minutes
- Clearing house entry for Plymouth
- Staffing level document
- Staff curriculum vitae
- PWID strand review
- Building bridges conference programme and flyer
- Interprofessional learning strand
- MLiP review and planning
- Placement handbook
- Programme handbook
- Covering letter

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	The Robert Gordon University
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of postal review	6 July 2016

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
 - Programme specification

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	The Robert Gordon University
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of postal review	6 July 2016

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
 - Programme specification

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	The Robert Gordon University
Programme title	Doctorate of Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of postal review	6 July 2016

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
 - Programme specification

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	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Joanne Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Beverley Ball (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	14 June 2016

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
 - Course handbook documentation
 - Recruitment summary

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.

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

Reason: From a review of the programme handbook the visitors noted that the education provider has lowered their International English Language Testing System (IELTS) scores on entry to the programme from 6.5 in all elements to 6.5 but with 5.5 elements. From this information, the visitors were unable to determine how the programme team satisfy themselves that upon completion of the programme students will be able to meet level 7 with no elements below 6.5. In addition, the visitors were unsure of the support that will be in place to ensure that students will be able progress from level 6 with elements of 5.5 to a level 7. As such, the visitors require further information the mechanisms in place for ensuring that students will have a good command of reading, writing and spoken English upon completion of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence for the mechanism in place for ensuring that students upon completion of the programme will be able to meet the requirements of level 7 with no elements below 6.5.

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

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors noted a statement in the submission that service users and carers contribute to programme lectures. However, the visitors could not determine what the contribution consisted of and how service users and carers are involved. They were also unclear, from the evidence provided, how the programme team determine which people are the most appropriate service users to be involved in the programme and what training might be provided to ensure they can be appropriately involved. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team involve service users and carers in the programme beyond the interaction with students. The visitors also require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine which service users and carers should be involved in the programme and why the involvement highlighted is appropriate.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how the programme team involve service users and carers in the programme, how they are chosen, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare them to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake.

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	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Ball (Therapeutic radiographer) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapy)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	14 June 2016

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
 - Accuracy and Reproducibility (Module Descriptor)
 - Course Document Radiotherapy and Oncology BSc (Hons).docx
 - Online prospectus for students
 - Strategic Framework and Key Principles of Academic Practice
 - Principles of Radiation Oncology 1
 - Principles of Radiation Oncology 2
 - Principles of Radiation Oncology 3
 - Principles of Radiation Oncology 4

- Clinical Education 3

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.

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

Reason: From a review of the programme handbook the visitors noted that the education provider has lowered their International English Language Testing System (IELTS) scores on entry to the programme from 6.5 in all elements to 6.5 but with 5.5 elements. In addition, the visitors noted the statement on page 17 in the course document that students are expected to manage and engage with an IELTS assessment process prior to completing the programme. From this information, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider satisfy themselves that upon completion of the programme students will be able to meet level 7 with no elements below 6.5. In addition, the visitors were unsure of the support that will be in place to assure that students will be able progress from level 6 with elements of 5.5 to a level 7. As such, the visitors require further information the mechanisms in place for ensuring that students will have a good command of reading, writing and spoken English upon completion of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence for the mechanism in place for ensuring that students upon completion of the programme will be able to meet the requirements of level 7 with no elements below 6.5.

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	South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust
Name of validating body	Institute of Healthcare Development
Programme title	IHCD Paramedic Award
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anthony Hoswell (Paramedic) Robert Fellows (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of postal review	6 July 2016

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 provide the internal quality report for two years ago and the external examiner's report for two years ago as these documents no longer exist.

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 visitors noted from the documentation provided that there was a problem with the allocation of placement hours for students. In particular, the external examiner noted concerns that the full 750 practice placement hours might not be achieved by all students. However, the visitors also noted that the education provider ensures that all students continue until the 750 practice placement hours are achieved and that there is an action plan in place to address this. The visitors also noted that this programme is not going to be running again. However, as there are still students on this programme, it is important that the education provider continues to keep this action plan under review until these students complete the programme.

Furthermore, the visitors noted that the documents initially submitted by the education provider for this annual monitoring audit did not fall within the correct years. The visitors wish to remind the education provider that documentation for annual monitoring audits should cover the two years prior to the current academic year; in this case, 2013-14 and 2014-15 for an audit in 2015-16.

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	Tavistock and Portman Foundation Health Trust
Name of validating body	University of Essex
Programme title	Doctorate in Child, Community and Educational Psychology (D.Ch.Ed.Psych.)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	15 July 2016

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
 - Parents as service users
 - Stakeholder meeting minutes

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 Ulster
Programme title	Pharmacotherapeutics in Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Prescription only medicine
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist, POM) Patricia Higham (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	14 June 2016

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
 - Course documentation
 - Student handbook
 - Appendices

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the student handbook, learning contract and service user and carer consent form. Whilst the mentioned documents alluded to service user and carer involvement on the programme, the visitors were not provided with any evidence which clearly demonstrated service user and carer involvement on the programme. For example, the visitors were unable to identify exactly who the service users and carers are for this programme, what their role is and how they are able to contribute to the programme. The visitors therefore require further documentation which clearly outlines who the service users and carers are for this programme and how they are involved. Further to this, the visitors require evidence to demonstrate that any service users and carers involved are appropriate to the profession and that their involvement is appropriate to the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate who the service users and carers are for this programme and at which stages of the programme they are involved.

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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	Certificate in Medicines Management (Conversion to Independent Prescribing)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Independent prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosie Furner (Independent prescriber) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	14 June 2016

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 Prescription only medicine PGCert Medicines Management

In 2013-14 academic year the Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management was undergoing internal University validation and approval from the HCPC, from SP alone to ISP under a new programme/ programme title. The Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management (Independent and Supplementary Prescribing) was therefore not offered in this academic year and audit applies only to 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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to evidence which outlined service users and carer involvement in student portfolios and reflections, via clinical placement and examination in practice. However, the visitors were unable to see how these platforms allowed service users and carers to contribute to the programme in an effective way. Specifically, the visitors were unable to see how direct input from service users and carers was collated, recorded and acted on within the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that service users and carers are able to contribute to the programme in an effective way.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates the role of the service user and carers are able to contribute to the programme in an effective way. For example, the processes used to gather record and act on their input.

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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the student handbook has discrepancies in the index and the appendices. The visitors recommend that the education provider reviews the documentation to ensure it is correct before it is given to students.

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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management (Independent and Supplementary Prescribing)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosie Furner (Independent prescriber) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	14 June 2016

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 Prescription only medicine PGCert Medicines Management

In 2013-14 academic year the Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management was undergoing internal University validation and approval from the HCPC, from SP alone to ISP under a new programme/ programme title. The Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines

Management (Independent and Supplementary Prescribing) was therefore not offered in this academic year and audit applies only to 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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to evidence which outlined service users and carer involvement in student portfolios and reflections, via clinical placement and examination in practice. However, the visitors were unable to see how these platforms allowed service users and carers to contribute to the programme in an effective way. Specifically, the visitors were unable to see how direct input from service users and carers was collated, recorded and acted on within the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that service users and carers are able to contribute to the programme in an effective way.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates the role of the service user and carers are able to contribute to the programme in an effective way. For example, the processes used to gather record and act on their input.

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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the student handbook has discrepancies in the index and the appendices. The visitors recommend that the education provider reviews the documentation to ensure it is correct before it is given to students.

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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management (Supplementary Prescribing)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosie Furner (Independent prescriber) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	14 June 2016

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 Prescription only medicine PGCert Medicines Management

In 2013-14 academic year the Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management was undergoing internal University validation and approval from the HCPC, from SP alone to ISP under a new programme/ programme title. The Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management (Independent and Supplementary Prescribing) was therefore not offered in this academic year and audit applies only to 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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to evidence which outlined service users and carer involvement in student portfolios and reflections, via clinical placement and examination in practice. However, the visitors were unable to see how these platforms allowed service users and carers to contribute to the programme in an effective way. Specifically, the visitors were unable to see how direct input from service users and carers was collated, recorded and acted on within the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that service users and carers are able to contribute to the programme in an effective way.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates the role of the service user and carers are able to contribute to the programme in an effective way. For example, the processes used to gather record and act on their input.

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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the student handbook has discrepancies in the index and the appendices. The visitors recommend that the education provider reviews the documentation to ensure it is correct before it is given to students.

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 Westminster
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	14 June 2016

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
 - ABMS Programme Specification 2012
 - ABMS Course Handbook 2014/2015
 - Work-Based Learning Policy 2014/2015
 - Work-Based Tutors' Handbook 2014/2015
 - Work-Based Learning 1, 2 and 3 Module Handbooks 2014/2015
 - Work-Based and University Tutors List 2014/2015
 - Example of ABMS Student Record
 - Examples of ABMS Students Attendance Sheets
 - WBL Tutors Newsletter December 2014

- Staff curriculum vitae

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.

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

Reason: In reviewing the evidence the visitors noted that the mapping document stated that evidence for SET 3.17 was not required or applicable. However all programmes are required to demonstrate how service users and carers have been involved in the programme in accordance to SET 3.17. As the education provider had not provided any evidence to demonstrate how the programme meets SET 3.17, the visitors were unable to determine how service users and carers are involved in the programme. In addition the visitors were unable to determine how service users are recruited, and how they are trained and supported for their involvement. Therefore they require additional evidence to demonstrate how the service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme. In addition evidence that demonstrates how service users are recruited, and how they are trained and supported for their involvement.

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 Wolverhampton
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Gary Dicken (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of postal review	18 July 2016

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
 - New staff curriculum vitae
 - Revised student complaints process
 - Overview of service user and carer strategy
 - Service user and carer Hub terms of reference

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 Wolverhampton
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker in England) Anne Mackay (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of postal review	12 July 2016

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
 - New staff curriculum vitae
 - Revised student complaints process
 - Service user and carer strategy

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.

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

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the information about the service user and carer involvement. From this evidence, the visitors noted that service users and carers were involved in the programme. However the visitors could not determine from the evidence provided how service users were identified and selected for their involvement in the programme. In addition, the visitors could not determine how the service users involved in the programme were trained and supported for their role. As such the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate how the standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers are identified and selected for their involvement in the programme. In addition, evidence that demonstrates how the service users and carers are trained and supported for their role in the programme is required.

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 Wolverhampton
Programme title	PG Diploma Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker in England) Anne Mackay (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of postal review	12 July 2016

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
- New staff curriculum vitae
- Revised student complaints process
- Service user and carer strategy

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.

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

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the information about the service user and carer involvement. From this evidence, the visitors noted that service users and carers were involved in the programme. However the visitors could not determine from the evidence provided how service users were identified and selected for their involvement in the programme. In addition, the visitors could not determine how the service users involved in the programme were trained and supported for their role. As such the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate how the standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers are identified and selected for their involvement in the programme. In addition, evidence that demonstrates how the service users and carers are trained and supported for their role in the programme is required.

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.