

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 Abertay Dundee
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) Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	17 February 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
 - Addressing SET 3.17 (Abertay BMS programme)

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	Academy for Healthcare Science
Programme title	Certificate of Attainment
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Clinical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Joy Rosenberg (Clinical scientist) Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	17 February 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
 - Curriculum vitae for new programme leader
 - Evidence to support involvement of service users and carers
 - Terms of reference for the Recruitment, and Education and Training Scrutiny groups

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	Academy for Healthcare Science
Programme title	Certificate of Equivalence
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Clinical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Joy Rosenberg (Clinical scientist) Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	17 February 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
 - Curriculum vitae for new programme leader
 - Evidence to support involvement of service users and carers
 - Terms of reference for the Recruitment, and Education and Training Scrutiny groups

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	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Aston University
Programme title	Aston Certificate in Audiology
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Alison Nicholls (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	26 January 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
 - Pathways to Embed Patient and Public Involvement in Healthcare Scientist Training Programme.

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 documentation, the visitors noted the comment “no students has enrolled for the full Aston certificate in Audiology, so we have only delivered the APEL route to registration”. In scrutinising the evidence, the visitors were unable to locate further information on the above statement and as such the visitors were unable to determine whether the programme continues to be secure within the education provider's business plan, and whether there is a future for this programme. The visitors were concerned that the programme no longer remains secure within the education provider's business plan and therefore is no longer a viable programme. The visitors will need further evidence to ensure this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates that the programme continues to have a secure place within the education provider's business plan.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted the comment “no students has enrolled for the full Aston certificate in Audiology, so we have only delivered the APEL route to registration”. In scrutinising the evidence, the visitors were unable to locate further information on the above statement. As such the visitors were unable to determine whether the programme continues to be effectively managed if no students are enrolled on the programme. Therefore, the visitors will need further evidence on how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate the programme continues to be effectively managed if the programme has not had any students on it.

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

Reason: From the information provided the visitors noted that the education provider has submitted the external examiner's report and the response to external examiner for year 2013–14. However, the visitors were not provided with the external examiner or the response to the external examiner's report for year 2014–15. Without this documentation, the visitors were unable to determine whether the programme continues to have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place. Therefore, further evidence is required to show this standard continues to be met.

Suggestion documentation: Evidence about monitoring and evaluation of the programme in academic year 2014–15. For example, external examiner’s report and the response to external examiner’s report for year 2014–15.

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

Reason: The visitors were provided with the pathway to embed patient and public involvement document. In securitising this evidence, the visitors were unable to determine how service users and carers are recruited on to this programme, the extent of their involvement and how they are trained and supported for their role. The visitors noted from the documentation that there are policies in place such as the induction and training policy. However, the visitors were not provided with this evidence and without seeing who the service users and carers are and how they are prepared for their role they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme without seeing the key documents.

Suggested Documentation: Further evidence on how service users and carers are involved in the programme. Information on how service users and carers are selected, trained and supported.

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 the documentation, the visitors noted that no changes have been made to the curriculum to reflect the current standards of proficiency for hearing aid dispensers. The standards of proficiency (SOPs) for hearing aid dispensers were revised to ensure that the standards are fit for purpose and came into effect from September 2014. As such education providers running an audiology programme are expected to demonstrate how they meet the revised SOPs through annual monitoring. However, in scrutinising the documentation the visitors were unable to locate evidence to demonstrate that the education provider has mapped to the current SOPs for hearing aid dispenser. Therefore, the visitors will need further evidence how the curriculum for the programme continues to meet this standard.

Suggested Documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for hearing aid dispensers.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted the comment “no students has enrolled for the full Aston certificate in Audiology, so we have only delivered the APEL route to registration”. In scrutinising the evidence, the visitors were unable to locate further evidence relating to the curriculum being current for this programme as it is yet to run. This standard requires evidence of how the activities of the programme team and any external stakeholders will make sure the curriculum stays relevant over time. If the programme has not run since it was approved the visitors are unsure how the programme team will ensure currency of the curriculum going forward. Therefore, the visitors need further evidence to ensure this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that the curriculum of the programme remains current.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that no changes have been made to the curriculum to reflect the current standards of proficiencies for hearing aid dispensers. The standards of proficiency (SOPs) for hearing aid dispensers were revised to ensure that the standards are fit for purpose. Education providers running an audiology programme are expected to demonstrate how they meet the revised SOPs through annual monitoring as these standards came into effect from September 2014. However, in scrutinising the documentation provided the visitors were unable to determine how the programme ensures the SOPs for hearing aid dispensers are embedded and assessed within the curriculum of the programme. Therefore, the visitors need further evidence to ensure this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate the assessment strategy will ensure students are able to meet the standards of proficiency for hearing aid dispensers.

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	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Aston 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	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Alison Nicholls (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	26 January 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
 - Pathways to Embed Patient and Public Involvement in Healthcare Scientist Training Programme.

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: The visitors were provided with the pathway to embed patient and public involvement document. In securitising this evidence, the visitors were unable to determine how service users and carers are recruited on to this programme, the extent of their involvement and how they are trained and supported for their role. The visitors noted from the documentation that there are policies in place such as the recruitment policy and induction and training policy. However, the visitors were not provided with this evidence and without seeing who the service users and carers are and how they are prepared for their role they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme without seeing the key document.

Suggested Documentation: Further evidence on how service users and carers are involved in the programme. Information on how service users and carers are selected, trained and supported.

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 the documentation, the visitors noted that no changes have been made to the curriculum to reflect the current standards of proficiencies for hearing aid dispensers. The standards of proficiency (SOPs) for hearing aid dispensers were revised to ensure that the standards are fit for purpose and came into effect from September 2014. As such education providers running an audiology programme are expected to demonstrate how they meet these revised SOPs through annual monitoring. However, in scrutinising the documentation the visitors were unable to locate evidence to demonstrate that the education provider has mapped to the current SOPs for hearing aid dispenser.

Suggested Documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for hearing aid dispensers.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the annual programme level report 2014–15 an increase in student numbers, “the programme was for 25 places and we now have a total of 31 students on the programme starting 2015–16”. However, the visitors noted that securing placements for student is a constant challenge for the

programme team. In considering the increase in student numbers and the challenges faced by the programme team in securing placements for students, the visitors were unable to determine what actions have been put in place by the education provider to ensure that the increase in student numbers will be matched with available placements. Therefore, the visitors require further information on the number, duration and range of practice placements and how placements continue to be appropriate in relation to the increase in student numbers to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to support the increase in student numbers in relation to the number, duration and range of practice placements and how this is appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that no changes have been made to the curriculum to reflect the current standards of proficiencies for hearing aid dispensers. The standards of proficiency (SOPs) for hearing aid dispensers were revised to ensure that the standards are fit for purpose and came into effect September 2014. As such education providers running an audiology programme are expected to demonstrate how they meet these revised standards through annual monitoring. However, in scrutinising the documentation provided the visitors were unable to determine how the programme ensures the SOPs for hearing aid dispensers are embedded and assessed within the curriculum of the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate the assessment strategy will ensure students are able to meet the standards of proficiency for hearing aid dispensers.

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	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Aston 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	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Alison Nicholls (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	26 January 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
 - Pathways to Embed Patient and Public Involvement in Healthcare Scientist Training Programme.

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: The visitors were provided with the pathway to embed patient and public involvement document. In securitising this evidence, the visitors were unable to determine how service users and carers are recruited on to this programme, the extent of their involvement and how they are trained and support for their role. The visitors noted from the documentation that there are policies in place such as the recruitment policy and induction and training policy. However, the visitors were not provided with this evidence and without seeing who the service users and carers are and how they are prepared for their roles they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme without seeing the key document.

Suggested Documentation: Further evidence on how service users and carers are involved in the programme. Information on how service users and carers are selected, trained and supported.

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 the documentation, the visitors noted that no changes have been made to the curriculum to reflect the current standards of proficiencies for hearing aid dispensers. The standards of proficiency (SOPs) for hearing aid dispensers were revised to ensure that the standards are fit for purpose and came into effect from September 2014. As such education providers running an audiology programme are expected to demonstrate how they meet the revised SOPs through annual monitoring. However, in scrutinising the documentation the visitors were unable to locate evidence to demonstrate that the education provider has mapped to the current SOPs for hearing aid dispenser. Therefore, the visitors will need further evidence how the curriculum for the programme continues to meet this standard.

Suggested Documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for hearing aid dispensers.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that no changes have been made to the curriculum to reflect the current standards of proficiencies for hearing aid dispensers. The standards of proficiency (SOPs) for hearing aid dispensers were revised to ensure that the standards are fit for purpose. Education providers running an audiology programme are expected to demonstrate how they meet the revised SOPs through annual monitoring as these standards came into effect from September 2014. However, in scrutinising the documentation provided the visitors were unable to determine how the programme ensures the SOPs for hearing aid dispensers are embedded and assessed within the curriculum of the programme. Therefore, the visitors will need further evidence how the curriculum for the programme continues to meet this standard

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate the assessment strategy will ensure students are able to meet the standards of proficiency for hearing aid dispensers.

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	4
Section five: Visitors' comments	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Aston 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	Carol Ainley (Biomedical scientist) Dianne Gammage (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	14 Januray 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
- Subject Review Meeting Minutes
- Draft Minutes of Curriculum Review
- BiologyBMS Periodic Review Response Placements
- Placement Provision and Activity Documents
- Staff Curriculum Vitae's
- University Regulations
- Strategy and reflections on SET 3.17

- Service User and Carer recruitment information
- Attending a Workshop with Biomedical Science Students
- Confidentiality Agreements
- Terms of Reference for Service User Advisory Group
- Report of Carmichaels Spring Session
- Schedule of Service User talks
- Current List of Service Users
- The Assignment: Reflecting on Listening to the Voices of Service Users
- Modules Taken by Applied BMS Students
- Module Specifications
- Revised mini-registration portfolio
- University General Regulations

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: The visitors were provided with a number of documents to evidence the involvement of service users and carers for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

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: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail regarding the external examiner recruitment policy and arrangements. The visitors were provided with external examiner reports from the previous two academic years from four different external examiners. The visitors noted that none of the listed external examiners are currently on the HCPC Register. In addition to this, the visitors were not

provided with any supporting information for three of the four listed external examiners as follows:

- Philip Cheetham;
- David Billington, and;
- Gary Entrican

The HCPC does not require that external examiners are on the Register, however where an external examiner is not on the Register it is necessary that the education provider notifies the HCPC so other arrangements can be agreed. The visitors were not provided with any evidence to support the appointment of the above mentioned external examiners or amendments to the recruitment policy and are therefore unable to make a judgement on their appropriate experience and qualifications to act as external examiners for this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Documentation which outlines appropriate experience and qualifications for Philip Cheetham, David Billington and Gary Entrican and a copy of the current external examiner recruitment policy

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 there are a number of identified changes due to take place in the 2015 – 16 academic year which impact curriculum, practice placements and staffing. The education provider should review the changes identified as being implemented in 2015 – 16 and consider where they might need to submit a major change notification. In addition to this the education provider should identify these changes in their next annual monitoring audit submission.

The visitors also identified changes to assessment in the 2017 – 18 academic year. The education provider should notify the HCPC of these changes through the major change process when appropriate.

Finally, the visitors wish to note to the education provider that any future changes to external examiners who are not registered with the HCPC should be notified via 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	Bangor University
Programme title	Non medical / Independent prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Andrew Hill (Chiroprapist / podiatrist) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	17 February 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 programme only enrolled students for the first time in 2014 as such there are no internal quality and external examiner reports 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 Bath
Programme title	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	Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	10 March 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.

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	Birmingham Metropolitan College
Name of awarding / validating body	Aston University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Local anaesthetic Prescription only medicine
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Andrew Hill (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	17 February 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.

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	Cardiff University
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	10 March 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.

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	City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer) Joy Rosenberg (Clinical scientist)
HCPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	17 February 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
 - Service user and carer involvement – eg admissions, minutes
 - Admissions information

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	City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiography (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	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) Helen White (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	18 February 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
 - Service user and carer document
 - Recruitment and selection process
 - Information provided to candidates regarding selection days
 - Numeracy test – sample questions
 - Literacy test – sample questions
 - Cambridge style personality questionnaire

- Interview questions
- Service user – involvement in design and selection process
- Service user – Attendance and role at selection days
- Staff student liaison committee minutes
- Communication with students document
- Student academic signing-in proforma
- Email proforma for students dropping below minimum attendance requirement
- Student academic attendance spreadsheet – example
- Service user involvement 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	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) 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	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) Helen White (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	18 February 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
 - City University webpages
 - Accreditation of Prior (experiential) Learning AP(E)L Policy
 - Staff handbook
 - Email from HCPC to Fiona Kyle
 - SLT Assurance meeting presentation to NCEL LETB
 - User and Carer Advisory Board Minutes
 - BSc SLT Programme handbook 14-15
 - Lecture capture at City University
 - Advanced PE training learning outcomes

- Website for students and practice educators
- Template letter to practice educators
- Assessment board procedures 14-15

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	City University
Programme title	MSc 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	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) Helen White (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	18 February 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
 - City University webpages
 - Accreditation of Prior (experiential) Learning AP(E)L Policy
 - Information for interview students
 - Interview questions and scoring criteria
 - Staff handbook
 - Email from HCPC
 - Working together 2014-15
 - SLT Assurance meeting presentation to NCEL LETB
 - User and Carer Advisory Board Minutes

- BSc SLT Programme handbook 14-15
- Lecture capture at City University
- Advanced PE training learning outcomes
- Website for students and practice educators
- Template letter to practice educators
- Assessment board procedures 14-15

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	City University
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	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) Helen White (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	18 February 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
 - City University webpages
 - Accreditation of Prior (experiential) Learning AP(E)L Policy
 - Information for interview students
 - Interview questions and scoring criteria
 - Staff handbook
 - Email from HCPC
 - Working together 2014-15
 - SLT Assurance meeting presentation to NCEL LETB
 - User and Carer Advisory Board Minutes

- BSc SLT Programme handbook 14-15
- Lecture capture at City University
- Advanced PE training learning outcomes
- Website for students and practice educators
- Template letter to practice educators
- Assessment board procedures 14-15

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 five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
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	David Childs (Social worker in England) Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	18 February 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
 - Minor modifications to modules for the last two years
 - Evidence to support student user and carer engagement

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 a comment in the Autumn Monitoring Report 2014-15 (dated 24 November 2015) which reads "The department are also reviewing their curriculum, with the Head noting that certain aspects of their provision were now redundant and that removing these will create space to consider other areas, for example globalisation." The visitors wish to highlight to the education provider that any changes or removal of 'redundant' aspects of the curriculum should be considered against our standards and if significant changes are made a major change notification form must be submitted to the HCPC.

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	Edge Hill University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Childs (Social worker in England) Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	18 February 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
- Minor modifications to modules for the last two years
- Evidence to support student user and carer engagement

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	Edge Hill University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Childs (Social worker in England) Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	18 February 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
 - Minor modifications to modules for the last two years
 - Evidence to support student user and carer engagement

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 Essex
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Biomedical Sciences (Integrated)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Carol Ainley (Biomedical scientist) Dianne Gammage (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	14 January 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
 - Terms of Reference for Annual Review and Management Committee.
 - A sample agenda for the upcoming Management Committee meeting.

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: The education provider provided the Biomedical Science Annual review Meeting Terms of Reference to evidence this standard, however this document did not mention service user or carer involvement. The education provider also referenced the Minutes of the Annual Review Meeting July 2015 however these were not included in the submission. The visitors were therefore unable to identify where and how service users and carers are involved in the programme and require further documentation to demonstrate this.

Suggested Documentation: Documentation which clearly outlines service user and carer involvement on the programme and minutes for the Annual Review Meeting July 2015.

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: In the Annual Review of Courses 2013 - 14 the education provider mentions that there have been “curriculum changes” and “new year 2 modules” for the programme. However the visitors were not provided with any information to support these changes. The visitors note that without reviewing the changes to curriculum and modules they cannot be sure that the learning outcomes continue to ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for biomedical scientists.

Suggested Documentation: Further documentation which outlines all curriculum changes and new modules introduced to 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 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 Essex
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Supplementary & Independent Prescribing for Physiotherapists and Podiatrists
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anthony Ward (Practitioner psychologist) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	14 January 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 did not submit any of the documentation because the programme has not run for the last two academic years.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that this programme was approved by the amended approval process in November 2014. The mapping document states that there will be students on the programme in 2016. However no evidence was provided that clearly demonstrates that the programme continues to have monitoring and evaluation systems in place to ensure this standard continues to be met. Therefore the visitors want evidence to demonstrate that the programme is regularly monitored and evaluated.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate that the programme has monitoring and evaluation system in place.

B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: For this annual monitoring audit, the visitors did not receive evidence for this audit as the programme has not run but intends to run shortly. Therefore the visitors were unsure that the programme continues to have sufficient staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that there are sufficient staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

B.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

Reason: For this annual monitoring audit, the visitors did not receive evidence for this audit that demonstrated that the programme continues to have the resources in place to support student learning in all settings.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates that the resources are in place to support student learning in all settings.

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

Reason: The visitors were informed via the audit form that service users and carers would be used as actors for the Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCE) and their feedback on student performance would be sought. The visitors were concerned that this information was not included in any standard documents provided for this audit to demonstrate that the students will be aware of this use of service users and carers within the programme. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to show how service users and

carers involvement in the programme is formally documented to ensure it is sustainable and appropriately managed. Additionally, how students are informed about this involvement.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers involvement will be formalised and students will be informed about the inclusion of service users and carers in OSCEs and throughout the programme.

C.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Reason: For this annual monitoring audit, the visitors did not receive any documentation relating to the curriculum being continues to be current for this programme as it is yet to run. Therefore the visitors could not be sure that the curriculum for programme continues to be current.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that the programme remains current.

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	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme title	A Conversion Programme to Prepare PH and CH Supplementary Prescribers as Independent Prescribers
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anthony Ward (Practitioner psychologist) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	14 January 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 did not submit any of the documentation because the programme has not run for the last two academic years.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that this programme was approved by the amended approval process in November 2014. The mapping document states that there will be students on the programme in 2016. However no evidence was provided that clearly demonstrates that the programme continues to have monitoring and evaluation systems in place to ensure this standard continues to be met. Therefore the visitors want evidence to demonstrate that the programme is regularly monitored and evaluated.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate that the programme has monitoring and evaluation system in place.

B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: For this annual monitoring audit, the visitors did not receive evidence for this audit as the programme has not run but intends to run shortly. Therefore the visitors were unsure that the programme continues to have sufficient staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that there are sufficient staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

B.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

Reason: For this annual monitoring audit, the visitors did not receive evidence for this audit that demonstrated that the programme continues to have the resources in place to support student learning in all settings.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates that the resources are in place to support student learning in all settings.

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

Reason: The visitors were informed via the audit form that service users and carers would be used as actors for the Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCE) and their feedback on student performance would be sought. The visitors were concerned that

this information was not included in any standard documents provided for this audit to demonstrate that the students will be aware of this use of service users and carers within the programme. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to show how service users and carers involvement in the programme is formally documented to ensure it is sustainable and appropriately managed. Additionally, how students are informed about this involvement.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers involvement will be formalised and students will be informed about the inclusion of service users and carers in OSCEs and throughout the programme.

C.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Reason: For this annual monitoring audit, the visitors did not receive any documentation relating to the curriculum being continues to be current for this programme as it is yet to run. Therefore the visitors could not be sure that the curriculum for programme continues to be current.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that the programme remains current.

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 Essex
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Childs (Social worker in England) Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	18 February 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
 - Scrutiny panel terms of reference
 - HHS service user engagement ethos
 - HHS service users reference group terms of reference
 - Experts by experience role description
 - The community recovery pathway project
 - Module outlines

The visitors did not review any documents for two years ago as the programme did not run in this time.

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 London, Goldsmith
Programme title	MA Art Psychotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Art therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Janek Dubowski (Art therapist) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	10 March 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
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Terms of reference
 - Timetable for Service user and carer sessions
 - 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	Southwest School of Dramatherapy
Name of validating body	University of Worcester
Programme title	MA in Dramatherapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Drama therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jane Fisher-Norton (Drama therapist) Tina Pyman (Drama therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of postal review	1 December 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 University Link Tutor report 2014-15
 - Annual University Link Tutor report 2013-14

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	MA Integrative Arts Psychotherapy
Name of validating body	University of East London
Programme title	MA Art Psychotherapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Art therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Julie Allan (Art therapist) Pauline Etkin (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	14 January 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 prospectus
 - Course information
 - Student handbook 2014–15
 - SOPs mapping document
 - Reflective account reading
 - Group process Journal

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 the mapping document the education provider stated service users and carers are involved in the teaching of the programme by delivering lectures and seminars. To find out further evidence about this involvement, the visitors were directed to evidence in student handbooks 2014–15 and 2014–15 year 3 and assessment handbook 2014–15. However, the visitors could not find any reference to service user and carer involvement in these documents. Therefore, the visitors will need evidence that demonstrate how service users and carers involvement occurs in this programme to determine if this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Information demonstrating that service user and carer involvement occurs 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 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	Keele University
Programme title	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicola Carey (Independent prescriber) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	18 February 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
 - module documentation
 - programme specification
 - timetable
 - staff CV's
 - placement documentation
 - appeals process
 - staff development policy and university peer review strategy

- slide set for legal and professional issues
 - evidence based practice (EBP) slides
 - application form
- The education provider did not provide documents from 2013–14 as the programme did not run in this year.

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: In order to evidence how this standard is met, the education provider provided a statement in their mapping document, that “A timetabled session with service users and students has been included in the programme”, along with the mentioned timetable. In considering whether this standard is met, the visitors were not clear who the service users and carers are, how they are prepared for their role in the session, and what specific learning is to be achieved in the session. The visitors were also not provided with enough clarity on the programme’s understanding of what service user and carer involvement is. For example, the visitors do not consider that the statement that the session was “for the service users to appreciate some of the restrictions that prescribers may have to work under when prescribing...” demonstrates how this standard is met in any way.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates who the service users are, how they are prepared, and how the session enhances student understanding of the service user perspective.

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	Keele University
Programme title	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicola Carey (Independent prescriber) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	18 February 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
 - module documentation
 - programme specification
 - timetable
 - staff CV's
 - placement documentation
 - appeals process
 - staff development policy and university peer review strategy
 - slide set for legal and professional issues

- evidence based practice (EBP) slides
- application form
- The education provider did not provide documents from 2013–14 as the programme did not run in this year.

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: In order to evidence how this standard is met, the education provider provided a statement in their mapping document, that “A timetabled session with service users and students has been included in the programme”, along with the mentioned timetable. In considering whether this standard is met, the visitors were not clear who the service users and carers are, how they are prepared for their role in the session, and what specific learning is to be achieved in the session. The visitors were also not provided with enough clarity on the programme’s understanding of what service user and carer involvement is. For example, the visitors do not consider that the statement that the session was “for the service users to appreciate some of the restrictions that prescribers may have to work under when prescribing...” demonstrates how this standard is met in any way.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates who the service users are, how they are prepared, and how the session enhances student understanding of the service user perspective.

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	Leeds Beckett University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Finoa McCullough (Dietitian) Nigal Westwood (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	10 March 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
 - Updated timetables
 - Programme handbook
 - Updated Student fitness to practice policy
 - Interprofessional learning document
 - Service user and carer involvement document
 - Pebble pad instructions
 - Clinical supervisory skills course handbook
 - Joint trainer network meeting programme

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	Leeds Beckett University
Programme title	Pg Dip Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Finoa McCullough (Dietitian) Nigal Westwood (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	10 March 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
 - Reflection and Consolidation module programme
 - Updated Student fitness to practice policy
 - Interprofessional learning programme and guidance
 - Service user and carers faculty strategy group annual report
 - Pebblepad e-portfolio guidelines
 - Clinical supervisory skills course handbook
 - Annual practice learning conference programme

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	London South Bank University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner) Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	17 February 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
 - Hyperlink to information about People's Academy
 - Student fitness to practice procedure

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 statement 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. 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 and how they have determined the appropriateness of the involvement.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the course monitor report 2014–15 that there have been concerns raised about the difference in the number of placements visited by students. In scrutinising the evidence, the visitors were unable to locate further information on what measures are put in place by the education provider to ensure that student have access to the same number of practice placements. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that the number, duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate how the number, duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes

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 Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) Helen White (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	18 February 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
 - Fitness to practice procedure

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 statement 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. 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 and how they have determined the appropriateness of the 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	London South Bank University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) Helen White (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	18 February 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
 - Fitness to practice procedure

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 statement 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. 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 and how they have determined the appropriateness of the 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	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Ruth Baker (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	10 March 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.

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	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Ruth Baker (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	10 March 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.

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 Northampton
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	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Janek Dubowski (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	10 March 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
 - Response to SET 3.17
 - Programme Specification
 - Weblinks
 - 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.

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
Recommendation of the visitors	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust
Name of validating body	University of Oxford
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin Psych)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Lincoln Simmonds (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of postal review	4 December 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
 - Health Education Thames Valley Annual Programme Review 2015, Service User and Carer Sub-Committee 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.

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

Reason: From the information provided the visitors noted that the education provider has submitted the external examiners' report and the response to external examiners' report for the 2013–14 academic year. However, the visitors were not provided with the external examiners' report or the response to the external examiners' report for the 2014–15 academic year. Without this documentation, the visitors were unable to determine whether the programme continues to have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place. Therefore, further evidence is required to show how this standard continues to be met.

Suggestion documentation: Evidence demonstrating effective monitoring and evaluation of the programme in academic year 2014–15. For example, the external examiners' report and the response to the external examiners' report for the 2014–15 academic year.

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 Plymouth
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	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Alison Nicholls (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	17 February 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
 - University webpages
 - Value based recruitment case study
 - Programme handbook
 - New staff curriculum vitae
 - Practice placement handbook
 - Service user meeting minutes
 - Service user engagement list

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 Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	17 February 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
 - Additional documents for evidence of service and carer involvement:
 - Minutes from service user group meetings
 - Evidence of service and carer involvement on the programme
 - Evidence of OCSE actors involvement
 - Stakeholder 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 Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Local anaesthetic Prescription only medicine
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Andrew Hill (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	17 February 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.

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 Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) David Childs (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	18 February 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
 - Admissions section open day presentation
 - Web page for admissions qualifications, values and NHS constitution
 - Alec Rickard curriculum vitae
 - Service user group meeting minutes
 - PHY122 module handbook
 - PHY217 practical workbook
 - Schedules of work

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 Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cellular Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Carol Ainley (Biomedical scientist) Dianne Gammage (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	14 Januray 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
 - Plymouth University Patient and Public Involvement Handbook
 - Patient and Public Involvement Framework Plymouth 2015
 - Plymouth University BSc Hons Healthcare Science Patient and Public Involvement requirements 2015-16
 - Email confirming approval of changes through Major Change Process

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: The visitors were provided with a number of documents to evidence the involvement of service users and carers for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

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 Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Carol Ainley (Biomedical scientist) Dianne Gammage (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	14 Januray 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
 - Plymouth University Patient and Public Involvement Handbook
 - Patient and Public Involvement Framework Plymouth 2015
 - Plymouth University BSc Hons Healthcare Science Patient and Public Involvement requirements 2015-16
 - Email confirming approval of changes through Major Change Process

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: The visitors were provided with a number of documents to evidence the involvement of service users and carers for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

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 Plymouth
Programme title	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner) Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	17 February 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
 - Module team meeting minutes
 - Service user group minutes
 - Module Handbook
 - Timetable 2015-16

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 Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Carol Ainley (Biomedical scientist) Dianne Gammage (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	14 Januray 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
 - Plymouth University Patient and Public Involvement Handbook
 - Patient and Public Involvement Framework Plymouth 2015
 - Plymouth University BSc Hons Healthcare Science Patient and Public Involvement requirements 2015-16
 - Email confirming approval of changes through Major Change Process

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: The visitors were provided with a number of documents to evidence the involvement of service users and carers for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

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	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	Aptitude Test in Hearing Aid Dispensing
Mode of delivery	Distance learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Alison Nicholls (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	26 January 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 programme ran for the first time in the academic year 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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted the information on service users and carers in the SETs mapping document and the information presented in the annual monitoring report 2014-15, which states “that service users and carers have been consulted”. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

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 the documentation, the visitors noted that no changes have been made to the curriculum to reflect the current standards of proficiency for hearing aid dispensers. The standards of proficiency (SOPs) for hearing aid dispensers were revised to ensure that the standards are fit for purpose and came into effect from September 2014. As such, education providers running an audiology programme are expected to demonstrate how they meet these revised standards through annual monitoring. However, in scrutinising the documentation the visitors were unable to locate evidence to demonstrate that the education provider has mapped to the current SOPs for hearing aid dispenser. Therefore, the visitors will need further evidence how the curriculum for the programme continues to meet this standard.

Suggested Documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for hearing aid dispensers.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that no changes have been made to the curriculum to reflect the current standards of proficiency for hearing aid dispensers. The standards of proficiency (SOPs) for hearing aid dispensers were revised

to ensure that the standards are fit for purpose and came in effect from September 2014. As such, education providers running an audiology programme are expected to demonstrate how they meet these revised standards through annual monitoring. However, in scrutinising the documentation provided the visitors were unable to determine how the programme ensures the SOPs for hearing aid dispensers are embedded and assessed within the curriculum of the programme. Therefore, the visitors need further evidence to ensure this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate the assessment strategy will ensure students are able to meet the standards of proficiency for hearing aid dispensers.

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 Margaret University
Programme title	Diploma in Higher Education Hearing Aid Audiology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Alison Nicholls (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	26 January 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: The visitors noted the information on service users and carers and their involvement in the assessment of competencies for students. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained and supported for their role. The visitors noted that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared and supported for their role in the programme they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme. Therefore, the visitors will need further evidence how this continues to meet this standard

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

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 Margaret University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Finoa McCullough (Dietitian) Nigel Westwood (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	10 March 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
 - Complaints process document
 - NES audit tool for practice placements

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	Queen Margaret 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	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Janek Dubowski (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	10 March 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
- QMU Public, Service User and Carer Involvement Strategy
- Level 4 Module Descriptor: Transformation through occupation.

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

From a review of the annual monitoring submission, the visitors noted the evidence supporting the proposed changes to the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme. However, annual monitoring is a retrospective process, which looks at the changes made to the programme in the last two academic years. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that they are expected to engage with the major change process in regards to the proposed changes outline in the annual monitoring submission as a possible result of the revalidation in April 2016.

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	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Janek Dubowski (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	10 March 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
 - QMU Public, Service User and Carer Involvement 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.

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

From a review of the annual monitoring submission, the visitors noted the evidence supporting the proposed changes to the MSc Occupational Therapy programme. However, annual monitoring is a retrospective process, which looks at the changes made to the programme in the last two academic years. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that they are expected to engage with the major change process in regards to the proposed changes outline in the annual monitoring submission as a possible result of the revalidation in April 2016.

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 Margret University
Programme title	MSc Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Finoa McCullough (Dietitian) Nigal Westwood (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	10 March 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 attendance policy
- School service user and carer framework
- Examples of digital patient stories
- Details of simulated patient information for summative assessments
- Feedback from service users copy of verified witness form for placement setting
- Fitness to practice policy

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 Margret University
Programme title	PgDip Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Finoa McCullough (Dietitian) Nigal Westwood (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	10 March 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 attendance policy
- School service user and carer framework
- Examples of digital patient stories
- Details of simulated patient information for summative assessments
- Feedback from service users copy of verified witness form for placement setting
- Fitness to practice policy

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	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	PgDip Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Janek Dubowski (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	10 March 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
 - QMU Public, Service User and Carer Involvement 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.

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

From a review of the annual monitoring submission, the visitors noted the evidence supporting the proposed changes to the PgDip Occupational Therapy programme. However, annual monitoring is a retrospective process, which looks at the changes made to the programme in the last two academic years. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that they are expected to engage with the major change process in regards to the proposed changes outline in the annual monitoring submission as a possible result of the revalidation in April 2016.

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 Margaret University
Programme title	Pharmacology for Podiatrists
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Prescription only medicine
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	26 February 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.

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	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	26 January 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
 - Module descriptors
 - Faculty Course and Module Change Proforma
 - Expert Patient Programme Handbook Service User Involvement
 - Commentary 'Nutrition Conference' Invitation

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	Roehampton University
Programme title	MA Dramatherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Drama therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dianne Gammage (Drama therapist) Carol Ainley (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	14 January 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
 - Full time Year One MA Dramatherapy Student Handbook 2015-16
 - Full time Year Two MA Dramatherapy Student Handbook 2015-16
 - Full time Year One MA Dramatherapy Timetable 15-16
 - Full Time Year Two MA Dramatherapy Timetable 15-16
 - Table of Service User and carer involvement in the programme
 - Information for Service User Theatre Company 'May Contain Nuts'
 - Poster 1. for 'Insidious Baggage'

- Poster 2. for 'Insidious Bagage'
- Poster for 'Butterflies & Lambs'
- Poster for 'The Trip'
- Poster for 'Little Cuts'

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: The visitors were provided with a number of documents to evidence the involvement of service users and carers for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that the proposed level of involvement was appropriate, however they were unable to identify how service users and carers would be trained to deliver their role. The visitors note that without seeing how service users and carers are prepared for their role in supporting the programme they cannot be certain that the proposed level of involvement will be appropriately delivered. The visitors also noted that they cannot be sure that service users and carers will be supported by the education provider for their involvement on this programme.

Suggested Documentation: Information on the training and support provided for service users and carers.

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 Ulster
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	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Janek Dubowski (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein
Date of assessment day	10 March 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
 - TH316 module schedule
 - OTH516 module schedule
 - PTH120 Interprofessional Study Day schedule
 - Service User Evaluation form

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

From a review of the annual monitoring submission, in particular the changes in the academics staff for this programme. The visitors are satisfied that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. However, the visitors would like to encourage the education provider to continue to monitor the number of staff in place to ensure there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place.

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	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Ruth Baker (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	10 March 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
 - Supporting documentary evidence for SET 3.17

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 South Wales
Programme title	MA Art Psychotherapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Art therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Julie Allan (Art therapist) Pauline Etkin (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	14 January 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 2015–16
 - Students handbook 2015–16 for year 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.

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

Reason: From a review of the external examiners' report for the last academic year the visitors noted comments regarding the absence of studio facilities for students. The visitors noted that the external examiner had reservations about the absence of facilities. In response to the external examiner report the education provider stated that:

- they do not provide any on site studio facilities and students were made aware of this during the interview process;
- there are 1.5 hours per week of undirected study for students to develop their art skills reflecting the HCPC requirements to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs), and;
- students are encouraged to travel to and negotiate with staff in all parts of the university should they wish to approach other departments to use art facilities.

The visitors were concerned and echoed the external examiners comments that students already travel long distances to get to university and further travel and negotiations may impact on students allocated 1.5 hours per week to develop their art skills. The visitors also noted that not all students will use other facilities and the allocated time to develop their skills as stated in the documentation. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to show how there are sufficient resources in place to support student learning in all settings and how these resources are effectively supporting the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the resources in place to support all student learning in all settings.

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

Reason: In the mapping document the education provider stated service users and carers are involved in the teaching of the programme by delivering lectures and seminars. To find out further evidence about this involvement, the visitors were directed to evidence in student handbooks 2014–15 and 2014–15 year 3 and assessment handbook 2014–15. However, the visitors could not find any reference to service user and carer involvement in these documents. Therefore, the visitors will need evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers involvement occurs in this programme to determine if this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Information demonstrating that service user and carer involvement occurs 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 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 South Wales
Programme title	MA Music Therapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Music therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Julie Allan (Arts therapist) Pauline Etkin (Music therapist)
HCPC executive	Abdur Razzaq
Date of assessment day	14 January 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 2015–16
 - Students handbook 2015–16 for year 3
 - Timetable 2014–15 for year 1 and 2
 - Module specification handbook
 - Assessment handbook 2014–15
 - Clinical 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.

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

Reason: From a review of the external examiners' reports for the last two academic years the visitors noted comments about staffing levels. The visitors noted that the external examiner stated "...although there has been a small increase in the staffing levels in academic year 2014–15 it still remains an issue". The external examiner continues to state that it has been difficult to keep up the level of input needed with all 3 years now up and running. Furthermore, some student issues including the weakness in clinical improvisation were attributable to the programme leader not having sufficient time to deliver and manage an effective programme. In addition, the programme leader is dealing with all areas of administration and responsible for the MA Art Psychotherapy students. In response to the external examiner report the education provider stated that a new staff member is taking on academic tutorials, some teaching and placement administration as well. However, the visitors echoed the external examiner comments that staffing remains an issue and is likely to impact on the adequate and appropriate number of staff to support the effective delivery of the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to show how there are sufficient, appropriate and adequate numbers of staff in place to support the effective delivery of the programme.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding adequate and appropriate staffing levels to support the delivery of the programme.

3.17 Service users and must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In the mapping document the education provider stated service users and carers are involved in the teaching of the programme by delivering lectures and seminars. To find out further evidence about this involvement, the visitors were directed to evidence in student handbooks 2014–15 and 2014–15 year 3 and assessment handbook 2014–15. However, the visitors could not find any reference to service user and carer involvement in these documents. Therefore, the visitors will need evidence that demonstrate how service users and carers involvement occurs in this programme to determine if this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Information demonstrating that service users and carers involvement occurs 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 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 the West of Scotland
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Carol Ainley (Biomedical scientist) Dianne Gammage (Arts therapist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham
Date of assessment day	14 January 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
- Employers Liaison Group Agendas and Minutes
- Curriculum Vitae for New External Examiner Dr Kevin Smith
- Modifications to Applied Biomedical Science Modules – Module Descriptors
- Modifications to Applied Biomedical Science Modules – Summary of Changes

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.

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.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Reason: The education provider has stated that there have been changes made to year three modules in the way of repackaging the learning outcomes. The visitors were provided with a number of documents to support this change including old and new module descriptors. However, the visitors noted that they were not provided with both old and new module descriptors for all modules on the programme. In addition to this, it was unclear when the changes to modules would be implemented. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgement on how the curriculum remains relevant to current practice and ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for biomedical scientists.

Suggested Documentation: A full set of previous and current module descriptors with clearly mapped changes, and projected timescale for implementing changes.

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 there has been a new external examiner appointed to the programme for the academic year 2015 - 16 who is not currently on the HCPC Register.

Whilst this annual monitoring audit does not cover the 2015 - 16 academic year the visitors wish to point out to the education provider that any external examiner who is not on the HCPC Register must be agreed by the HCPC. Therefore it is recommended that the education provider submits major change notification to outline this change.

The visitors also noted that the education provider mentions a future campus relocation. Although this has been identified as a future major change by the education provider the visitors would like to reiterate that the HCPC should be notified of this change via 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	York St John 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	Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Ruth Baker (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	10 March 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
- MSc (Pre-Registration) Physiotherapy Validated Programme Document
- Staff curriculum vitae
- MSc (Pre-Registration) Physiotherapy Interview Schedules
- Email to Service Users

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

From a review of the annual monitoring submission, the visitors noted the evidence to support the change in programme leader for the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) programme. Upon reviewing the evidence, the visitors were satisfied that the new programme leader is appropriately qualified and experienced to have overall professional responsibility. However, the visitors would like to remind the education provider that annual monitoring is a retrospective process that looks at the changes made to the programme in the last two academic years. Any changes made in the current year should be reported by the major change process.