

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	Birmingham City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist) Dawn Blenkin (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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 engagement document
 - Timetables
 - Service user and carer strategy
 - Framework for SU simulation
 - Student workbook

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.

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

Reason: On reading the documentation, the visitors noted in the response to the external examiner 2015 – 2016 report that there was an issue over the number of main texts in the library for students. It was also noted that access to the electronic books was also an issue due to licencing agreements. The visitors were therefore unclear as to whether there are sufficient text books for the number of students on the programme. As such, the visitors would like to see evidence that demonstrates that there are sufficient main text and electronic books which are accessible at points of high demand for the number of students in each cohort.

Suggested documentation: Evidence which clearly demonstrates that there are sufficient main texts and electronic books available for the cohort at points of high demand.

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 comment

The visitors noted several references by external examiners and students to limited resources of essential texts submitted as part of the annual monitoring audit. The visitors requested clarification regarding accessibility of key texts and reference material in relation to student numbers. The visitors noted the course team's response and their efforts to

minimise the effect of budget constraints on provision of library reading material, especially felt at times of high demand, when large numbers of students are simultaneously seeking access to key texts. This situation appears to be ongoing, and therefore should be closely monitored. The visitors recommend the course team, in cooperation with their learning resources centre, endeavour to ensure adequate numbers of reference copies of essential texts are available at all times.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Bournemouth University
Programme title	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals (Non Medical Prescribing)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Independent prescriber) Nicola Carey (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	27 February 2017

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
- Postgraduate admissions regulations
 - Academic appeals policy
 - Continuous monitoring of academic taught awards
 - Dignity, diversity & equality policy
 - Designated Medical Practitioner handbook
 - HCPC & V300 Admission student information
 - HCPC NMP programme handbook
 - NHS NMP Prescribing Confirmation

- NMP Survey
- Programme specification - Supplementary and Independent prescribing for Physiotherapist and Chiropodists/Podiatrists
- Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
- Application form
- HCPC major change notification form
- FHSS student guidance

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors could not see in the documentation clear evidence of who the education provider regarded as service users and carers, and how they involved them in the programme. The mapping document defines “all students and staff” as service users and carers, but the document to which the mapping referred, “Non-medical Prescribing Survey”, was a survey of the Bournemouth University Carer & Service User Group and did not mention students and staff.

The visitors considered that the “Non-medical Prescribing Survey” document did not provide sufficient evidence about the involvement of the service users and carers in the programme. It was a generic survey sent to all members of the BU Carer & Service User Group about their various experiences with, and views about, allied health professions’ prescribing. It was not clear whether those who completed this survey had been involved with the specific programme under consideration here, or whether their views were being incorporated into the structure and content of the programme.

Suggested documentation: The education provider should provide evidence showing that service users and carers have had specific involvement with this programme. If students and staff are defined as service users and carers, evidence should be provided of their involvement in that capacity.

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	Bournemouth University
Programme title	Supplementary and Independent Prescribing For Physiotherapists and Chiropodists / Podiatrists
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Independent prescriber) Nicola Carey (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	27 February 2017

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
 - Postgraduate admissions regulations
 - Academic appeals policy
 - Continuous monitoring of academic taught awards
 - Dignity, diversity & equality policy
 - Designated Medical Practitioner handbook
 - HCPC & V300 Admission student information
 - HCPC NMP programme handbook

- NHS NMP Prescribing Confirmation
- NMP Survey
- Programme specification - Supplementary and Independent prescribing for Physiotherapist and Chiropodists/Podiatrists
- Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
- Application form
- HCPC major change notification form
- FHSS student guidance

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors could not see in the documentation clear evidence of who the education provider regarded as service users and carers, and how they involved them in the programme. The mapping document defines “all students and staff” as service users and carers, but the document to which the mapping referred, “Non-medical Prescribing Survey”, was a survey of the Bournemouth University Carer & Service User Group and did not mention students and staff.

The visitors considered that the “Non-medical Prescribing Survey” document did not provide sufficient evidence about the involvement of the service users and carers in the programme. It was a generic survey sent to all members of the BU Carer & Service User Group about their various experiences with, and views about, allied health professions’ prescribing. It was not clear whether those who completed this survey had been involved with the specific programme under consideration here, or whether their views were being incorporated into the structure and content of the programme.

Suggested documentation: The education provider should provide evidence showing that service users and carers have had specific involvement with this programme. If students and staff are defined as service users and carers, evidence should be provided of their involvement in that capacity.

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	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme title	MSc in mental health and approved mental health professional practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social Worker in England) Jane Hutchison (Approved Mental Health Professional)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of postal review	5 May 2017

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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes 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	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Mental Health and Approved Mental Health Professional Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social Worker in England) Jane Hutchison (Approved Mental Health Professional)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of postal review	5 May 2017

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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes 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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes 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	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme title	FD Health and Social Care (Paramedic Practice)
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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 Pathway review report 2015-2016
 - Programme specification versions 2 - 6
 - Periodic programme review
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Action plan
 - Team meeting minutes 2016
 - Module leaders evaluation summary 2016

- Student pathway handbook 2016
- Mentor list
- Placement learning environment audit tool 2016-17
- Equipment list
- Programme timetable

The programme began in September 2015, as such documentation for the previous year 2014-15 has not been provided.

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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 Chester
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social Work
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Dicken (Social worker in England) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - Attendance Monitoring Check In Poster,
 - BA Social Work (Major Change Documentation - August 2016),
 - BA (Hons) Social Work Entry Requirements

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 on their reading of the documentation for the annual monitoring audit they noted that the audit form guided them to the Module feedback form and programme committee minutes to demonstrate service user and carer involvement in the programme. The visitors could not see clearly the involvement of service user and carers in the programme. There was no evidence that demonstrated how the education provider selects service user and carers into the programme, or how they would be trained and supported in the role of service user and carer in the programme. As such the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme and how they are trained and supported in this role.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that clearly demonstrates the involvement of service user and carers in the programme and how they are trained and supported in this role.

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 Chester
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social Work
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Dicken (Social worker in England) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - MA Social Work Entry Requirements
 - Extracts from Module Feedback Forms & Induction Evaluations
 - Programme 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 visitors on their reading of the documentation for the annual monitoring audit they noted that the audit form guided them to the extracts from the Module feedback form and programme committee minutes to demonstrate service user and carer involvement in the programme. The visitors could not see clearly the involvement of service user and carers in the programme. There was no evidence that demonstrated how the education provider selects service user and carers into the programme, or how they would be trained and supported in the role of service user and carer in the programme. As such the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme and how they are trained and supported in this role.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that clearly demonstrates the involvement of service user and carers in the programme and how they are trained and supported in this role.

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 Chester
Programme title	Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social Work
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Dicken (Social worker in England) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
- MA Social Work Entry Requirements
- Extracts from Module Feedback Forms & Induction Evaluations
- Programme 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 visitors on their reading of the documentation for the annual monitoring audit they noted that the audit form guided them to the extracts from the Module feedback form and programme committee minutes to demonstrate service user and carer involvement in the programme. The visitors could not see clearly the involvement of service user and carers in the programme. There was no evidence that demonstrated how the education provider selects service user and carers into the programme, or how they would be trained and supported in the role of service user and carer in the programme. As such the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme and how they are trained and supported in this role.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that clearly demonstrates the involvement of service user and carers in the programme and how they are trained and supported in this role.

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	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	Dip HE Paramedic Practice (HM Armed Forces)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Sara Smith (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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 and part time programme handbooks
 - Personal tutoring policy
 - Professional practice case conference ToR
 - Fitness to Practice policy
 - PPI documents
 - PARE documents

There are no external examiner's reports for two years ago relating to this programme because the programme began in September 2015.

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that university-wide policies and procedures exist to support public and patient involvement (PPI). In review of Appendix B, the visitors also noted that service users and carers are involved in a range of activities including monitoring and evaluation of the programme, training delivery, OSCE assessments, curriculum development and providing feedback. The visitors read that there is a service user with direct experience of paramedic service involved in the programme. However the visitors were unable to determine how the service users and carers that are involved with this programme are selected as the most appropriate individuals to be involved in the programme. From the evidence, the visitors could not determine the exact involvement the service user and carer would have in the programme. As such, the visitors were unclear what involvement service users and carers have in the programme and what preparation the team has done to ensure the success of this involvement, including the training and support of service users and carers. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team follow to determine which service users are most appropriate to be involved in the programme, how they have determined the appropriateness of the involvement and how service users and carers are be trained and supported.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to clearly demonstrate how the education provider selects, trains and supports the involvement of service users and carers for this 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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors recommend that the education provider consider submitting distinct and defined information for part time and full time programmes in order to clarify which information relates to which 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 Cumbria
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (Level7) (Conversion)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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 policy
 - Personal Tutoring Policy
 - Expenses and Payments policy
 - PPI Marketing flyer
 - PPI Steering group membership and TOR
 - PPI staff guidelines
 - PPI Values statement

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors considered the evidence provided as part of the audit information. The visitors noted that the education provider had detailed how they planned to involve service users and carers in the programme, including student recruitment, curriculum development and delivery, and student assessment. The visitors also saw information about how the service users and carers would be recruited, supported and trained. However, it was not clear in the documentation that these plans had been implemented, therefore the visitors could not determine that service users and carers are involved in the programme. It was also noted that the planned involvement was to be implemented for July 2016 which is in the academic year being considered as part of this audit. Therefore the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how the planned service user and carer involvement has been implemented from July 2016.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how the planned service user and carer involvement has been implemented as of July 2016. Any evidence provided should clearly demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (Level 6) (Conversion)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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 policy
 - Personal Tutoring Policy
 - Expenses and Payments policy
 - PPI Marketing flyer
 - PPI Steering group membership and TOR
 - PPI staff guidelines
 - PPI Values statement

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors considered the evidence provided as part of the audit information. The visitors noted that the education provider had detailed how they planned to involve service users and carers in the programme, including student recruitment, curriculum development and delivery, and student assessment. The visitors also saw information about how the service users and carers would be recruited, supported and trained. However, it was not clear in the documentation that these plans had been implemented, therefore the visitors could not determine that service users and carers are involved in the programme. It was also noted that the planned involvement was to be implemented for July 2016 which is in the academic year being considered as part of this audit. Therefore the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how the planned service user and carer involvement has been implemented from July 2016.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how the planned service user and carer involvement has been implemented as of July 2016. Any evidence provided should clearly demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	University Award Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (Level 6) (with SP pathway and IP pathway)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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 policy
 - Personal Tutoring Policy
 - Expenses and Payments policy
 - PPI Marketing flyer
 - PPI Steering group membership and TOR
 - PPI staff guidelines
 - PPI Values statement

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors considered the evidence provided as part of the audit information. The visitors noted that the education provider had detailed how they planned to involve service users and carers in the programme, including student recruitment, curriculum development and delivery, and student assessment. The visitors also saw information about how the service users and carers would be recruited, supported and trained. However, it was not clear in the documentation that these plans had been implemented, therefore the visitors could not determine that service users and carers are involved in the programme. It was also noted that the planned involvement was to be implemented for July 2016 which is in the academic year being considered as part of this audit. Therefore the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how the planned service user and carer involvement has been implemented from July 2016.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how the planned service user and carer involvement has been implemented as of July 2016. Any evidence provided should clearly demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	University Award Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (Level 7) (with SP pathway and IP pathway)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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 policy
 - Personal Tutoring Policy
 - Expenses and Payments policy
 - PPI Marketing flyer
 - PPI Steering group membership and TOR
 - PPI staff guidelines
 - PPI Values statement

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors considered the evidence provided as part of the audit information. The visitors noted that the education provider had detailed how they planned to involve service users and carers in the programme, including student recruitment, curriculum development and delivery, and student assessment. The visitors also saw information about how the service users and carers would be recruited, supported and trained. However, it was not clear in the documentation that these plans had been implemented, therefore the visitors could not determine that service users and carers are involved in the programme. It was also noted that the planned involvement was to be implemented for July 2016 which is in the academic year being considered as part of this audit. Therefore the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how the planned service user and carer involvement has been implemented from July 2016.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how the planned service user and carer involvement has been implemented as of July 2016. Any evidence provided should clearly demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	University Award Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (Level 6) (Supplementary Prescribing)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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 policy
 - Personal Tutoring Policy
 - Expenses and Payments policy
 - PPI Marketing flyer
 - PPI Steering group membership and TOR
 - PPI staff guidelines
 - PPI Values statement

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.

Reason: The visitors considered the evidence provided as part of the audit information. The visitors noted that the education provider had detailed how they planned to involve service users and carers in the programme, including student recruitment, curriculum development and delivery, and student assessment. The visitors also saw information about how the service users and carers would be recruited, supported and trained. However, it was not clear in the documentation that these plans had been implemented, therefore the visitors could not determine that service users and carers are involved in the programme. It was also noted that the planned involvement was to be implemented for July 2016 which is in the academic year being considered as part of this audit. Therefore the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how the planned service user and carer involvement has been implemented from July 2016.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how the planned service user and carer involvement has been implemented as of July 2016. Any evidence provided should clearly demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme title	University Award Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (Level 7) (Supplementary Prescribing)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	13 April 2017

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 policy
 - Personal Tutoring Policy
 - Expenses and Payments policy
 - PPI Marketing flyer
 - PPI Steering group membership and TOR
 - PPI staff guidelines
 - PPI Values statement

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors considered the evidence provided as part of the audit information. The visitors noted that the education provider had detailed how they planned to involve service users and carers in the programme, including student recruitment, curriculum development and delivery, and student assessment. The visitors also saw information about how the service users and carers would be recruited, supported and trained. However, it was not clear in the documentation that these plans had been implemented, therefore the visitors could not determine that service users and carers are involved in the programme. It was also noted that the planned involvement was to be implemented for July 2016 which is in the academic year being considered as part of this audit. Therefore the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how the planned service user and carer involvement has been implemented from July 2016.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how the planned service user and carer involvement has been implemented as of July 2016. Any evidence provided should clearly demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
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	James McManus (Clinical psychologist) Kathryn Burgess (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
 - Letter from the Head of Department
 - Service user and carer committee 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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted from the 2014-15 external examiner's report that some "financial issues were reported to be affecting some aspects of the Programme for both staff and trainees." In particular, there was a "low level of funding" for continuing professional development (CPD) and research development for both staff and trainees. As such, the visitors could not determine from the evidence provided, that there is a commitment to providing enough resources to allow staff to remain up to date with their CPD activities. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme continues to have a secure place in the education provider's business plan and that staff are allocated sufficient resources to be able to undertake staff development activities.

Suggested documentation: Evidence, such as an action plan, to demonstrate that financial issues are being addressed so that staff are able to undertake continuing professional development and remain up to date.

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

Reason: The visitors noted from the service user and carer committee meeting notes that service users and carers are involved in a range of activities on the programme such as interviews and workshops. However, the visitors were not able to see any evidence to demonstrate that service users and carers are appropriately prepared and supported to undertake these roles. As such, they require further evidence which demonstrates that this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence and information about how service users and carers are prepared and supported to undertake their roles on 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	London Metropolitan University
Programme title	MSc Dietetics and Nutrition
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Sara Smith (Dietitian) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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: From a review of the supporting information document, on page 37, the visitors read that ambassadors from the patients association are involved in a range of activities including a focus group which reviews course structure, curriculum and recruitment policy. Service users and carers are also involved in assessment of students and are consulted in relation to the delivery of the programme. However the visitors were unable to determine how the service users and carers that are involved with this programme are selected as the most appropriate individuals to be involved in the programme. From the evidence, the visitors could not determine the exact involvement the service user and carer would have in the programme. As such, the visitors were unclear what involvement service users and carers have in the programme and what preparation the team has done to ensure the success of this involvement, including the training and support of service users and carers. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team follow to determine which service users are most appropriate to be involved in the programme, how they have determined the appropriateness of the involvement and how service users and carers are be trained and supported.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to clearly demonstrate how the education provider selects, trains and supports the involvement of service users and carers for 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	London Metropolitan University
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma Dietetics and Nutrition (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Sara Smith (Dietitian) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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: From a review of the supporting information document, on page 37, the visitors read that ambassadors from the patients association are involved in a range of activities including a focus group which reviews course structure, curriculum and recruitment policy. Service users and carers are also involved in assessment of students and are consulted in relation to the delivery of the programme. However the visitors were unable to determine how the service users and carers that are involved with this programme are selected as the most appropriate individuals to be involved in the programme. From the evidence, the visitors could not determine the exact involvement the service user and carer would have in the programme. As such, the visitors were unclear what involvement service users and carers have in the programme and what preparation the team has done to ensure the success of this involvement, including the training and support of service users and carers. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team follow to determine which service users are most appropriate to be involved in the programme, how they have determined the appropriateness of the involvement and how service users and carers are be trained and supported.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to clearly demonstrate how the education provider selects, trains and supports the involvement of service users and carers for 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	Oxford Brookes 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	Natalie Matchett (Occupational therapist) Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	2 May 2017

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
 - Evidence for Service User Involvement
 - Previous and revised module descriptors

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.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Date submission received	02 May 2017
Case reference	CAS-11064-H7F7W1

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Anthony Power	Physiotherapist
Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist
Mandy Hargood	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum student cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM05897

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. The visitors noted in the external examiners report that there were high marks being awarded for practice placement. The visitors considered this could impact on how the assessment of students at practice placements. The visitors noted that the education provider are addressing the issue with additional training for practice placement educators. The visitors would like to keep this under review via the next annual monitoring audit for this 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 Portsmouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - Floor plan of extended simulation centre

The programme began in September 2015, as such documentation for the previous year 2014-15 has not been provided.

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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: Visitor comments.....	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nigel Westwood (Biomedical scientist) Carol Ainley (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	2 May 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
 - Internal quality report for one year ago
 - Internal quality report for two years ago
 - External examiner's report for one year ago
 - External examiner's report for two years ago
 - Response to external examiner's report one year ago
 - Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- Course handbook
 - Training manual
 - Student mentor scheme handbook
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - HCS Employer Liaison meeting minutes
 - Additional academic staff profile

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: Visitor comments

The visitors were content that the standards were met. The visitors would like the education provider to consider the service user and carers for the programme. The visitors would like the education provider to consider widening its current pool of service user and carers so as to include "organisations or other clinicians" (such as medical and nursing practitioners) that directly use the services of biomedical scientists.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Prosthetist / orthotist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Hazel Currie (Prosthetist / orthotist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of postal review	19 May 2017

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 focus group minutes
 - Service user interaction with students
 - Programme evaluation and action log

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 five: Visitors' comments	5

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sheffield
Programme title	Doctor of Educational and Child Psychology (DEdCPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitor	Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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
- Although requested by the HCPC, the education provider did not provide specific responses to the external examiner's reports. However, they included responses to comments from the external examiner in their internal quality monitoring documentation, and in an action plan for each of the two 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 of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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

Reason: In their Annual Course Reflection document for 2014-15, the education provider has noted that information regarding changes to bursaries was to be introduced into student contracts. However, no supporting documentation was provided relating to this change, and it was not mapped in the audit form. The visitor considered that applicants to the programme would need to know about the bursary that they would be entitled to. Therefore, this information would need to be given to potential trainees, to allow them to make an informed decision to take up the offer of a place on the programme. However, no updated admissions information was provided with the submission, so the visitor was unable to make this judgement.

Suggested documentation: Advertising and / or admissions information which is updated with accurate and current information about bursaries.

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

Reason: From reviewing the internal quality monitoring documentation, and the external examiner's reports, the visitor noted that:

- sections 1-10 of the 2014-15 Annual Course Reflection document were not completed;
- it was not clear where or whether comments made by the external examiner in the 2015-16 report would be carried through by the programme team. For example, the "Areas to develop as noted by the group of trainees" were not picked up in the Action Plan, which was provided as a response to the report;
- it was not clear that there was education provider or school level oversight or input into the internal quality assurance processes. For example, pro-formas were not completed (as noted above), and the 2015-16 external examiner report was not provided in the same format as the 2014-15 report.

The visitor noted that it seemed that documentation was not being used as intended, and was therefore unclear whether regular internal quality monitoring processes are still in place for the programme. In addition the visitor was unclear how the internal quality processes consistently feed into programme development, or how programme level policies are managed at an institution level. Therefore, the visitor cannot be sure that this standard continues to be met with the information provided.

Suggested documentation: Information that demonstrates that the programme has regular and effective quality monitoring processes in place based on education provider requirements.

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

Reason: To demonstrate how this standard is met, the education provider has noted that they:

- have included a “parent representative” in the trainee selection process;
- will hold stakeholder meetings in different parts of Yorkshire and Humberside;
- introduced a “stimulus film” which forms part of the trainee section day, developed in partnership with a parent association; and
- will make further developments in the 2016-17 academic year.

However, the visitor noted that, although there is currently some service user and carer involvement in discrete areas of the programme, it is not clear how this involvement will continue or develop. They are also unable to make a judgement about whether appropriate individuals or groups are involved in appropriate ways, as they have not been provided with any information about how the education provider selects its service users. Therefore, so they can be satisfied that this standard is met, the education provider must provide further evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers will continue to be involved in the programme and how this involvement is appropriate

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the programme will ensure continuing service user and carer involvement, along with a rationale about who their service users and carers are and why their involvement is appropriate to the delivery of the programme.

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 their Annual Course Reflection on 2015-16, the education provider has noted that they are developing “the therapeutics (Yr 2) curriculum theme”. From the information provided, the visitor was unclear what these developments were, but considered that developing a theme in the curriculum will likely impact on the learning outcomes for the programme. Therefore, this could impact on how the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for educational psychologists are delivered. This change was not referenced in the education provider’s mapping. As such, in order to make a judgement that the programme continues to meet this standard, the visitor needs further information.

Suggested documentation: Information that explains what the changes are, and demonstrates how the SOPs for educational psychologists continue to be delivered by the programme. If the changes are significant, this could include a SOPs mapping document along with module descriptors.

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: In their Annual Course Reflection on 2014-15, the education provider has noted that they have introduced a new “post-16 placement experience”. The visitor noted that, although this is a national development in educational psychology programmes, it changes the range of placements expected of trainees. This change was not reflected in the education provider’s mapping. The visitors noted that introducing a new placement experience could impact how the range of placements support the delivery of the

programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes, and therefore require further documentation to ensure this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Information that demonstrates how there is an appropriate range of placements 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: Similarly to the reasons noted for SET 4.1, the visitor considered that if a theme is changing in the curriculum, then the assessment strategy and design may also change. As the education provider has not provided any information in their mapping about this change, and has not provided any further information, the visitor needs further information in order to make a judgement that the programme continues to meet this standard.

Suggested documentation: Information that explains what the changes are, and demonstrates how the SOPs for educational psychologists continue to be assessed by the programme. If the changes are significant, this could include a SOPs mapping document along with module descriptors.

6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Reason: In their Annual Course Reflection on 2014-15, the education provider has noted that they intended to “develop clearer procedures around the... PASS/FAIL assessment grading in order to achieve consistency across the programme and across assessments”, to be implemented in September 2015. No further information was provided around this change, and it was not referenced in the education provider’s mapping document. The visitor considered that changing assessment grading could impact on the way this standard is met, specifically in ensuring consistency and objectivity in the assessment of trainees’ work, and therefore needs to see further information to support this change.

Suggested documentation: Information that demonstrates how revised assessment grading will ensure consistency and objectivity in assessments.

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 the monitoring documentation, the visitor noted that several potential or ongoing changes were being discussed by the programme, namely:

- to the programme management structure, to be implemented by September 2017;
- implementation of a new virtual learning environment, in the 2016-17 academic year;
- “trainee numbers are increasing further” from the 2016-17 academic year
- there are outstanding staff vacancies;
- there will be a “reworked research Yr 1 research project” implemented from September to December 2016; and
- change questions in first year essays, from September 2016.

All of the above changes could impact on the way that the programme meets the standards of education and training. Therefore, the education provider should ensure that they report changes to the HCPC as and when they happen, or specifically flag them through their next annual monitoring audit submission. Particularly, the education provider should contact the HCPC to clarify the increase in student numbers, as even a small increase in numbers can have a significant impact on the programme’s ability to run effectively.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sheffield
Programme title	BMed Sci (Hons) Orthoptics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Orthoptist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Timms (Orthoptist) Helen Orton (Orthoptist)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of postal review	5 May 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sheffield
Programme title	MMED Sci Clinical Communication Studies
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - Appendices 1-28 including; 2016 and 2017 Practice Educators Training Day Agenda and Practice Educator Feedback
 - Practice Educators Training Day Agenda and Practice Educator Feedback
 - HC252 Developmental Disorders of Communication Module Handbook
 - Voice Module Handbook 2017
 - Life Story Group Leaflet
 - Small Talk Group Leaflet
 - 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
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sheffield
Programme title	B.Med Sci (Hons) Speech
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - Appendices 1-28 including; 2016 and 2017 Practice Educators Training Day Agenda and Practice Educator Feedback
 - Practice Educators Training Day Agenda and Practice Educator Feedback
 - Developmental Disorders of Communication Module Handbook
 - Voice Module Handbook 2017
 - Life Story Group Leaflet
 - Small Talk Group Leaflet
 - 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
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2
Section five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sheffield
Programme title	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social Work
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Dicken (Social worker in England) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - Teaching committee meeting minutes (Sample)
 - Exam Board minutes
 - Readiness to practice meeting minutes
 - Placement quality assurance minutes and slides
 - Student year rep and 2nd year cohort meeting minutes (sample)
 - Service user involvement report 15/16;HCPC
 - Major modification notification 2016

The internal audit report for 15/16 is not included because:

As part of becoming a Teaching Partnership (TP), the education provider was required to conduct a comprehensive review of the MASW curriculum to ensure that it was matched against the DfE/DoH KSS C&F and adults respectively. This was to ensure that the quality of the course, in terms of content, practice relevance and student satisfaction, was at the required level and to ensure that processes, such as admissions, fully met the TP criteria. The conclusion of that process was the HCPC Major Modification submitted in March of 2016 was approved. The education provider then considered that this process took the place of the annual report for that year. For 16/17 they adopted a similar process for the internal/external annual quality report.

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted the service user involvement report 2015 – 2016. The report identifies the areas where service users and carers are involved in the programme. However the visitors could not determine how service users and carers are selected, supported and trained in their role. The visitors therefore want to see further information that demonstrates how the service users and carers are selected, trained and supported in their roles in the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are selected, trained and supported in the role to demonstrate how they are involved in the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards 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, in the Quality and Curriculum review report 16/17 for the South Yorkshire Teaching Partnership Curriculum Development Group and University of Sheffield teaching Committee, that there are several change to modules and placements for the September 2017 start. The changes are yet to be formalised, but the visitors recommend that once the proposed changes have been agreed, the education provider should consider submitting a major change detailing the changes to ensure that the HCPC standards for the programme continue to be met.

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	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sheffield
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social Work
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Dicken (Social worker in England) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
- Teaching committee meeting minutes (Sample)
 - Exam Board minutes
 - Readiness to practice meeting minutes
 - Placement quality assurance minutes and slides
 - Student year rep and 2nd year cohort meeting minutes (sample)

- Service user involvement report 15/16;HCPC
- Major modification notification 2016

The internal audit report for 15/16 is not included because:

As part of becoming a Teaching Partnership (TP), the education provider was required to conduct a comprehensive review of the MASW curriculum to ensure that it was matched against the DfE/DoH KSS C&F and adults respectively. This was to ensure that the quality of the course, in terms of content, practice relevance and student satisfaction, was at the required level and to ensure that processes, such as admissions, fully met the TP criteria. The conclusion of that process was the HCPC Major Modification submitted in March of 2016 was approved. The education provider then considered that this process took the place of the annual report for that year. For 16/17 they adopted a similar process for the internal/external annual quality report.

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted the service user involvement report 2015 – 2016. The report identifies the areas where service users and carers are involved in the programme. However the visitors could not determine how service users and carers are selected, supported and trained in their role. The visitors therefore want to see further information that demonstrates how the service users and carers are selected, trained and supported in their roles in the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are selected, trained and supported in the role to demonstrate how they are involved in the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards 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, in the Quality and Curriculum review report 16/17 for the South Yorkshire Teaching Partnership Curriculum Development Group and University of Sheffield teaching Committee, that there are several change to modules and placements for the September 2017 start. The changes are yet to be formalised, but the visitors recommend that once the proposed changes have been agreed, the education provider should consider submitting a major change detailing the changes to ensure that the HCPC standards for the programme continue to be met.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Assessment Handbook
 - Programme Handbook
 - Standards of proficiency mapping 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.