

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Birmingham City University
Programme title	Dip HE Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anthony Hoswell (Paramedic) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	8 December 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

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

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

Reason: From a review of the programme annual review 2015-16 it states that “Students are also expected to participate in a variety of hospital based placements during the programme but the majority of this process is left to the student to initiate.” However the visitors noted that the web page available to applicants does not specify requirements for students to source their own non-ambulance placement. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how applicants are provided with this information prior to taking up a place on the programme.

Suggested documentation: Information provided to applicants regarding the requirement for a students to source their own hospital based placements.

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

Reason: From a review of the Value Based Recruitment Document the visitors noted that a service user is involved in the interview process. However, the visitors could not see an explanation and justification of how service user and carer involvement takes place and how it is appropriate for this programme. Therefore, the visitors require documentation which details how and why service users and carers are selected and supported to be involved in the programme and further details of this involvement in order to demonstrate this SET is met.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the recruitment, support and involvement of service users and carers and justification of how this involvement is appropriate for this programme

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

Reason: From a review of the programme annual review 2015-16 the visitors noted, in the ‘Placements’ section of the internal quality review document, that students are required to provide a supporting letter from their employer confirming their ability to complete 750 hours of clinical placement during the course. However, the document also states that students have experienced difficulties in completing these hours, requiring “lengthy problem solving” between the education provider and employer. However, the visitors did not see evidence to demonstrate how the education provider is addressing this issue within the documentation provided. Therefore, the visitors could not be certain that all

students are acquiring the required number, duration and range of practice placements and require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about how the education provider is addressing the issue of students' difficulty to complete clinical hours

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: The visitors noted in the programme annual review 2015-16 that students are expected to source their own hospital based placements and that this process needs to be reviewed by the education provider. However the visitors could not see evidence of how the education provider has reviewed the process and, therefore, how the education provider ensures that the range of hospital based placements is appropriate. As such, the visitors require documentation which shows how the education provider ensures the number and range of practice placements is appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Suggested documentation: Information demonstrating how the education provider ensures the number and range of placements are appropriate, including hospital-based placements.

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 are satisfied that the relevant standards are met by this programme. However, the visitors recommend that the education provider consider writing a clear statement in future advertising material that articulates that students are responsible for ensuring that they have access to the range of practice placements and are expected to arrange these placements in order to complete the course. This will ensure that potential student have access to clear and concise information required to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Birmingham City University
Programme title	Principles of Prescribing for Health Care Professionals
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicola Carey (Independent prescribing) James Pickard (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	16 December 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- Non medical prescribing for health care professionals course guide
- Principles of prescribing for health care professionals course guide
- Designated Medical Supervisor Handbook level 6
- Designated Medical Supervisor Handbook level 7
- Educationally led practice assessment document Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals Level 6

- Educationally led practice assessment document Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals Level 7
- Email correspondence external examiner
- Information Birmingham City University Forum for Accessing Community Experience

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: From a review of the evidence provided the visitors are unclear as to whether service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors were able to see that individual students are expected to interact and respond to the needs of individual service users in their placement training. However, no evidence was submitted which showed how service users are involved in the programme overall, what their involvement and contributions are and how they are appropriately trained. As such, the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team use in order to determine how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors also require further evidence as to how the programme team train and prepare the service users and carers to ensure that they can fulfil any role they are being asked to undertake.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how service users and carers form part of the programme, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare the service users and carers to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake where applicable.

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	Birmingham City University
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals (Undergraduate)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicola Carey (Independent prescribing) James Pickard (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	16 December 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- Non medical prescribing for health care professionals course guide
- Principles of prescribing for health care professionals course guide
- Designated Medical Supervisor Handbook level 6
- Designated Medical Supervisor Handbook level 7
- Educationally led practice assessment document Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals Level 6

- Educationally led practice assessment document Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals Level 7
- Email correspondence external examiner
- Information Birmingham City University Forum for Accessing Community Experience

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: From a review of the evidence provided the visitors are unclear as to whether service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors were able to see that individual students are expected to interact and respond to the needs of individual service users in their placement training. However, no evidence was submitted which showed how service users are involved in the programme overall, what their involvement and contributions are and how they are appropriately trained. As such, the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team use in order to determine how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors also require further evidence as to how the programme team train and prepare the service users and carers to ensure that they can fulfil any role they are being asked to undertake.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how service users and carers form part of the programme, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare the service users and carers to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake where applicable.

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	Birmingham City University
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals (Undergraduate) (Conversion)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicola Carey (Independent prescribing) James Pickard (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	16 December 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- Non medical prescribing for health care professionals course guide
- Principles of prescribing for health care professionals course guide
- Designated Medical Supervisor Handbook level 6
- Designated Medical Supervisor Handbook level 7
- Educationally led practice assessment document Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals Level 6

- Educationally led practice assessment document Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals Level 7
- Email correspondence external examiner
- Information Birmingham City University Forum for Accessing Community Experience

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: From a review of the evidence provided the visitors are unclear as to whether service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors were able to see that individual students are expected to interact and respond to the needs of individual service users in their placement training. However, no evidence was submitted which showed how service users are involved in the programme overall, what their involvement and contributions are and how they are appropriately trained. As such, the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team use in order to determine how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors also require further evidence as to how the programme team train and prepare the service users and carers to ensure that they can fulfil any role they are being asked to undertake.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how service users and carers form part of the programme, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare the service users and carers to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake where applicable.

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	Birmingham City University
Programme title	Principles of Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals (Post Graduate)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicola Carey (Independent prescribing) James Pickard (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	16 December 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- Non medical prescribing for health care professionals course guide
- Principles of prescribing for health care professionals course guide
- Designated Medical Supervisor Handbook level 6
- Designated Medical Supervisor Handbook level 7
- Educationally led practice assessment document Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals Level 6

- Educationally led practice assessment document Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals Level 7
- Email correspondence external examiner
- Information Birmingham City University Forum for Accessing Community Experience

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: From a review of the evidence provided the visitors are unclear as to whether service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors were able to see that individual students are expected to interact and respond to the needs of individual service users in their placement training. However, no evidence was submitted which showed how service users are involved in the programme overall, what their involvement and contributions are and how they are appropriately trained. As such the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team use in order to determine how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors also require further evidence as to how the programme team train and prepare the service users and carers to ensure that they can fulfil any role they are being asked to undertake.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how service users and carers form part of the programme, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare the service users and carers to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake where applicable.

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	Birmingham City University
Programme title	Principles of Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals (Post Graduate) (Conversion)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant entitlement	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicola Carey (Independent prescribing) James Pickard (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	16 December 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Non medical prescribing for health care professionals course guide
 - Principles of prescribing for health care professionals course guide
 - Designated Medical Supervisor Handbook level 6
 - Designated Medical Supervisor Handbook level 7
 - Educationally led practice assessment document Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals Level 6

- Educationally led practice assessment document Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals Level 7
- Email correspondence external examiner
- Information Birmingham City University Forum for Accessing Community Experience

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: From a review of the evidence provided the visitors are unclear as to whether service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors were able to see that individual students are expected to interact and respond to the needs of individual service users in their placement training. However, no evidence was submitted which showed how service users are involved in the programme overall, what their involvement and contributions are and how they are appropriately trained. As such, the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team use in order to determine how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors also require further evidence as to how the programme team train and prepare the service users and carers to ensure that they can fulfil any role they are being asked to undertake.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how service users and carers form part of the programme, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare the service users and carers to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake where applicable.

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	Birmingham City University
Programme title	Non-medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicola Carey (Independent prescribing) James Pickard (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	16 December 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- Non medical prescribing for health care professionals course guide
- Principles of prescribing for health care professionals course guide
- Designated Medical Supervisor Handbook level 6
- Designated Medical Supervisor Handbook level 7
- Educationally led practice assessment document Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals Level 6

- Educationally led practice assessment document Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals Level 7
- Email correspondence external examiner
- Information Birmingham City University Forum for Accessing Community Experience

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: From a review of the evidence provided the visitors are unclear as to whether service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors were able to see that individual students are expected to interact and respond to the needs of individual service users in their placement training. However, no evidence was submitted which showed how service users are involved in the programme overall, what their involvement and contributions are and how they are appropriately trained. As such, the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team use in order to determine how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors also require further evidence as to how the programme team train and prepare the service users and carers to ensure that they can fulfil any role they are being asked to undertake.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how service users and carers form part of the programme, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare the service users and carers to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake where applicable.

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 Bedfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Teresa Rogers (Social worker in England) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Course Information Form
 - Updated Fitness to Practise Policy
 - Service User and Carer Information booklet

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the internal quality report 2014-2015 and in the external examiner report for 2015-2016 that the education provider had made some changes to the curriculum. The visitors noted that there was an introduction of a new Literature Review module and that there was a change to the “pattern of the literature review so as to spread the workshops out over two terms to mirror the progress of the review”. The visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted. The visitors were unsure as to whether the literature review module has replaced any other modules or whether there were changes to the delivery pattern. The visitors were therefore, unable to determine whether there are any changes to the learning outcomes, and therefore the delivery of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the Literature review module, including the learning outcomes, the delivery pattern and module descriptors.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the internal quality report 2014-2015 that the education provider had made changes to the assessment strategy and design. The education provider has highlighted changes to the assessment of the Foundations of Social Work Practice and the Developing Academic & Professional Skills modules and they have also introduced a “new % marking scheme” for level 4 and 5 students as the level 6 students remained on the “16 scale grade system”. The visitors did not receive revised module descriptors or a revised assessment strategy and a major change notification form had not been submitted. The visitors were unclear as to whether the new assessment methods were appropriate for the level 4 and 5 students, the Foundations of Social Work Practice and the Developing Academic & Professional Skills modules. They could therefore, not determine whether any of the changes made to the assessment of these modules were appropriate to measure the learning outcomes, and therefore the achievement of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the new assessment strategy and design for the level 4 and 5 students and the Foundations of Social Work Practice and Developing Academic & Professional Skills modules.

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 Bedfordshire
Programme title	MSc Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Teresa Rogers (Social worker in England) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Course Information Form
 - Updated Fitness to Practise Policy
 - Service User and Carer Information booklet

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 Bedfordshire
Programme title	Postgraduate Diploma in Professional Social Work Practice
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Teresa Rogers (Social worker in England) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	16 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
- Course Information Form
 - Updated Fitness to Practise Policy
 - Service User and Carer Information booklet

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 Bedfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Practice Assessment Document (PAD) year 1 Paramedic
 - PAD year 2 Paramedic
 - Course information form (CIF)
 - Paramedic team 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 Birmingham
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Teresa Rogers (Social worker in England) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Tutoring information document
 - Programme management board meeting minutes (2015)
 - Programme management board meeting minutes (2016)
 - Welfare officer role description

There is no response to the external examiner's report from a one year ago as there were no issues to respond to.

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 Birmingham
Programme title	Postgraduate Diploma in Higher Specialist Work in Mental Health Services (AMHP)
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Patricia Higham (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Brendon Edmonds
Date of assessment day	13 March 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	University of Birmingham
Programme title	Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Teresa Rogers (Social worker in England) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Tutoring information document
 - Programme management board meeting minutes (2015)
 - Programme management board meeting minutes (2016)
 - Welfare officer role description

There is no response to external examiner's report from a one year ago as there were no issues to respond to.

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 Birmingham
Programme title	Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Specialist Work in Mental Health Services (AMHP)
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Patricia Higham (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive	Brendon Edmonds
Date of assessment day	13 March 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	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Bournemouth University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dawn Blenkin (Occupational therapist) Russell Hart (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Service user and carer annual 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.

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

Reason: From a review of the internal quality reports and external examiner reports the visitors noted that there has been some long term staff absence compounded by staff turnover, which has impacted aspects of the delivery of the programme. As such the visitors could not determine how the education provider had put measures in place to ensure that with the staff absence and vacancies, there would continue to be an adequate number of staff in place to run the programme. Therefore the visitors require additional documentation that demonstrates how the education provider ensured that there continued to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme in response to the staff shortages.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the education provider ensured that there continued to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme in response to the staff shortages highlighted in the audit documentation reviewed.

3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Reason: When reviewing the internal quality report and the external examiners report the visitors noted that there have been times where lectures had been cancelled at short notice or not run due to availability of physical room resources. As part of the documentation reviewed, the visitors could not determine how the education provider had responded to the issues raised to ensure that the facilities to support student learning were readily available to students and staff throughout the years considered as part of this audit. Therefore the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate that during the education provider ensured that the learning resources, were readily available to students and staff considering the issues highlighted.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how in response to the concerns identified, the education provider ensured that the learning resources were readily available to students and staff during the years considered as part of this programme.

4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Reason: When reviewing the internal quality report and the external examiners report, the visitors noted that there has been a reduction in the number of teaching hours on the programme. With this reduction the visitors could not see what learning and teaching

approaches had been put in place to accommodate this reduction. Therefore the visitors could not determine that the range of learning and teaching approaches used were appropriate to the effective delivery of the programme in the academic years considered as part of this audit. Therefore the visitors require additional documentation to demonstrate how the learning and teaching approaches used continued to be appropriate.

Suggested documentation: Additional documentation that demonstrates how, as part of the reduction of direct teaching, the overall learning and teaching approaches used continued to be appropriate to the effective delivery of the programme, such as a learning and teaching strategy.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Bournemouth University
Programme title	FdSc Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Radiographer) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - HSC Carer and Service User Participation – Student Feedback

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted from the documentation that this programme is closing, as such the education provider must provide information about the closure 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	Bournemouth University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Radiographer) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - HSC Carer and Service User Participation – Student Feedback

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
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
 - Supporting evidence for service user and carer involvement

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted comments made by previous visitors in the last annual monitoring audit report for the programme, about the merger of two schools from January 2014 to form the new School of Health Sciences. Although the visitors specifically noted that "changes to programme management and resources must be highlighted to the HCPC", the education provider has not highlighted this change either via this audit submission, or via the major change process. The visitors consider that a change such as this could impact on the security of the programme's place in the education provider's business plan, as there may be different competing priorities compared to the old school structure. Therefore, the visitors are unclear whether any changes made impact on how this standard is met by the programme, and if there have been changes, how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the programme continues to have a secure place in the education provider's business plan, considering structural changes at the education provider.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: Considering the structural change noted above, visitors consider that how the programme is managed could be impacted, as there may be different competing priorities compared to the previous structure. The visitors noted that there may be changes to the senior management structure, which could impact on this standard being met. In addition, the visitors also noted that the name of the old school is referred to in documentation produced following the restructure. Therefore, the visitors are unclear whether any changes made impact on how this standard is met by the programme, and if there have been changes, how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the programme continues to be effectively managed, considering structural changes at the education provider.

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

Reason: Considering the structural change noted above, visitors consider that how resources are used by the programme could be impacted, as there may be different competing priorities compared to the previous structure. Therefore, the visitors are unclear whether any changes made impact on how this standard is met by the programme, and if there have been changes, how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the programme continues to effectively use resources to support student learning, considering structural changes at the education provider.

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 Brighton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dawn Blenkin (Occupational therapist) Russell Hart (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Programme handbook
 - Placement handbook
 - Role descriptor for service user rep
 - Proposed changes to entry criteria
 - Admissions policy

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	MSc Rehabilitation Science (Physiotherapy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
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
 - Supporting evidence for service user and carer involvement

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted comments made by previous visitors in the last annual monitoring audit report for the BSc (Hons) programme, about the merger of two schools from January 2014 to form the new School of Health Sciences. Although the visitors specifically noted that "changes to programme management and resources must be highlighted to the HCPC", the education provider has not highlighted this change either via this audit submission, or via the major change process. The visitors consider that a change such as this could impact on the security of the programme's place in the education provider's business plan, as there may be different competing priorities compared to the old school structure. Therefore, the visitors are unclear whether any changes made impact on how this standard is met by the programme, and if there have been changes, how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the programme continues to have a secure place in the education provider's business plan, considering structural changes at the education provider.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: Considering the structural change noted above, visitors consider that how the programme is managed could be impacted, as there may be different competing priorities compared to the previous structure. The visitors noted that there may be changes to the senior management structure, which could impact on this standard being met. In addition, the visitors also noted that the name of the old school is referred to in documentation produced following the restructure. Therefore, the visitors are unclear whether any changes made impact on how this standard is met by the programme, and if there have been changes, how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the programme continues to be effectively managed, considering structural changes at the education provider.

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

Reason: Considering the structural change noted above, visitors consider that how resources are used by the programme could be impacted, as there may be different competing priorities compared to the previous structure. Therefore, the visitors are unclear whether any changes made impact on how this standard is met by the programme, and if there have been changes, how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the programme continues to effectively use resources to support student learning, considering structural changes at the education provider.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	Pg Dip Rehabilitation Science (Physiotherapy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
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
 - Supporting evidence for service user and carer involvement

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted comments made by previous visitors in the last annual monitoring audit report for the BSc (Hons) programme, about the merger of two schools from January 2014 to form the new School of Health Sciences. Although the visitors specifically noted that "changes to programme management and resources must be highlighted to the HCPC", the education provider has not highlighted this change either via this audit submission, or via the major change process. The visitors consider that a change such as this could impact on the security of the programme's place in the education provider's business plan, as there may be different competing priorities compared to the old school structure. Therefore, the visitors are unclear whether any changes made impact on how this standard is met by the programme, and if there have been changes, how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the programme continues to have a secure place in the education provider's business plan, considering structural changes at the education provider.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: Considering the structural change noted above, visitors consider that how the programme is managed could be impacted, as there may be different competing priorities compared to the previous structure. The visitors noted that there may be changes to the senior management structure, which could impact on this standard being met. In addition, the visitors also noted that the name of the old school is referred to in documentation produced following the restructure. Therefore, the visitors are unclear whether any changes made impact on how this standard is met by the programme, and if there have been changes, how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the programme continues to be effectively managed, considering structural changes at the education provider.

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

Reason: Considering the structural change noted above, visitors consider that how resources are used by the programme could be impacted, as there may be different competing priorities compared to the previous structure. Therefore, the visitors are unclear whether any changes made impact on how this standard is met by the programme, and if there have been changes, how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the programme continues to effectively use resources to support student learning, considering structural changes at the education provider.

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 Brighton
Programme title	Independent Prescribing (1)
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
- Application form
- Complaints procedure
- Contract Monitoring Report for Health Education London & South East (formerly Kent, Surrey and Sussex)
- Curriculum Vitae for Team members
- Equity and Diversity policy
- General Examination and Assessment Regulations (GEAR)
- Handbook for Students

- Handbook for Approved Medical Practitioner
- Health Education London & South East (formerly Kent, Surrey and Sussex) information sheet
- Invitation to selection interview letter
- NA6113 Module handbook
- Programme Specification mapping
- Prescribing Portfolio NA6113
- Selection Interview Powerpoint presentation
- Statement of Compliance - Head of School, Health Sciences

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	Supplementary Prescriber to Independent Prescriber Conversion Programme
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
 - Application form
 - Complaints procedure
 - Contract Monitoring Report for Health Education London & South East (formerly Kent, Surrey and Sussex)
 - Curriculum Vitae for Team members
 - Equity and Diversity policy
 - General Examination and Assessment Regulations (GEAR)

- Handbook for Students
- Handbook for Approved Medical Practitioner
- Health Education London & South East (formerly Kent, Surrey and Sussex) information sheet
- Invitation to selection interview letter
- NA6113 Module handbook
- Programme Specification mapping
- Prescribing Portfolio NA6113
- Selection Interview Powerpoint presentation
- Statement of Compliance - Head of School, Health Sciences

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dawn Blenkin (Occupational therapist) Russell Hart (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Occupational Therapy Course Board – Lived Experience Lay Representative
 - Email regarding change to course leader

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 Brighton
Programme title	Certificate in Clinical Pharmacology
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Prescription only medicine – sale / supply
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist with prescription only medicine – sale / supply) 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
 - Module descriptors and handbook
 - Student handbooks
 - Staff CVs
 - Summary of proposed changes to MSc
 - Previous HCPC report
 - Student FTP procedure
 - MSc programme specification
 - Draft timetable

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	1
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2
Section five: Visitors' comments	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Brunel University
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Consent to role play form
 - Guide to assessment

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted from the audit form that the education provider intends to increase recruitment on the MA to 45 in September 2017 and to 50 in September 2018, and has asked to have these increases approved as part of this annual monitoring process. The visitors could not consider approval for these increases because annual monitoring is a retrospective process.

They would like to remind the education provider that they should submit a major change notification form to the HCPC before going ahead with these increases. Year-on-year increases in enrolment may affect the programme's ability to meet the standards of education and training, for example by requiring more staff and resources. While the visitors noted that the education provider seem to envisage that the increased recruitment to, and resourcing of, the MA will be enabled by the closure of the BA, they considered that staff and resources can not necessarily be straightforwardly reassigned from undergraduate to graduate programmes, because of differences in level of study or the teaching expertise required.

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	Brunel University
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Master's exit route only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Consent to role play form
 - Guide to assessment

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted from the audit form that the education provider intends to increase recruitment on the MA to 45 in September 2017 and to 50 in September 2018, and has asked to have these increases approved as part of this annual monitoring process. The visitors could not consider approval for these increases because annual monitoring is a retrospective process.

They would like to remind the education provider that they should submit a major change notification form to the HCPC before going ahead with these increases. Year-on-year increases in enrolment may affect the programme's ability to meet the standards of education and training, for example by requiring more staff and resources. While the visitors noted that the education provider seem to envisage that the increased recruitment to, and resourcing of, the MA will be enabled by the closure of the BA, they considered that staff and resources can not necessarily be straightforwardly reassigned from undergraduate to graduate programmes, because of differences in level of study or the teaching expertise required.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Brunel University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jane Grant (Occupational therapist) Dawn Blenkin (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of postal review	27 January 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
 - BSc (Hons) Cover letter
 - Module reviews 2013-14
 - Module reviews 2014-15
 - Programme timetable
 - Mental health study day
 - Board of studies minutes
 - Placement report
 - Programme handbook

- Escalation of concerns 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.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the internal review documents for the years being assessed as part of the audit. The visitors also reviewed the previous annual monitoring report which highlighted a concern about a reduction in the number of teaching staff on the programme. In the internal review document for 2015-16 the visitors noted there to be concerns raised by staff and students about the impact of the previous reduction in the number of staff, including a lack of access to academic tutors and some lectures being cancelled due to staff availability. In the internal monitoring report the visitors noted that these issues were being raised to head of department, however there was no indication as to how this is currently being resolved following the escalation to head of department. Considering the duration of staff shortage identified and current action plans, the visitors could not see how the programme has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place as the ongoing issues identified by staff and students have not been resolved as part of the process. Therefore the visitors require additional documentation that demonstrates how the education provider has resolved the issues identified in the internal monitoring reports.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how there has been regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place. Any evidence provided should clearly demonstrate how the education provider has resolved the issues identified in the internal monitoring reports as part of their monitoring and evaluation processes.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the internal review documents for the years being assessed as part of the audit. The visitors also reviewed the previous annual monitoring report which highlighted a concern about a reduction in the number of teaching staff on the programme. In the internal review document for 2015-16 the visitors noted there to be concerns raised by staff and students about the impact of the previous reduction in the number of staff, including a lack of access to academic tutors and some lectures being cancelled due to staff availability. In the internal monitoring report the visitors noted that these issues were being raised to head of department, however there was no indication as to how this is currently being resolved following the escalation to head of department. Considering the duration of staff shortage identified and current action plans, the visitors could not see how there has been and will continue to be an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme. Therefore the visitors require additional documentation to demonstrate there is and will continue to be an adequate number of

appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme in light of the concerns raised by staff, students and previous annual monitoring audits.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates that there is currently and will continue to ensure that there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme considering the concerns raised by staff and students, such as an action plan.

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 received further information about the staffing of this programme through this process and as such are content that the programme continues to meet this standard. However, they did note that concerns about students' access to staff were raised through the previous annual monitoring audit and through the internal quality monitoring procedures of the education provider. Given the time period over which concerns about students' access to staff, and the ability of staff to cover unscheduled absences, have been raised the visitors recommend that the education provider considers how best to monitor these issues. Through appropriate monitoring of these issues the education provider may be better able to identify why they are continuing to arise and what the causes may be. This may also enable the education provider to identify how best to resource the programme for the future, given the potential changes to the size of cohorts in subsequent years.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Brunel University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	18 January 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
 - Student handbook
 - Minutes of Board of Studies meetings
 - Module descriptions
 - Documents relating to service user involvement

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Reason: The visitors noted that effective timetabling had been an ongoing issue in the programme. This has been highlighted in internal quality monitoring as well as in student feedback. The internal annual monitoring form for 2015-16 states that “timetabling remains a severe problem” (page 7). The education provider’s response to this issue was not noted as a change in the mapping document submitted by the education provider. Other management issues identified in the submission include challenges raised by changes to course structure (page 3) and the effectiveness of internal quality monitoring (page 3). The visitors also did not see evidence of the measures being taken to address these problems. As the visitors were unclear how issues identified were being addressed, they were unclear how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Documents demonstrating that concerns over timetabling and other management issues will be addressed appropriately going forward, to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that staffing levels had been an ongoing issue for the programme (page 9 of internal annual monitoring), and that this is potentially adding to problems with timetabling and use of resources. Internal monitoring documents and past HCPC processes have highlighted this, although there were no changes flagged by the education provider in the SETs mapping document. As the visitors were unclear how issues identified were being addressed, they were unclear how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Documents to demonstrate that action is being taken to ensure appropriate staffing levels for the delivery of an effective programme.

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

Reason: Internal monitoring documents have suggested that there are ongoing issues around the programme’s use of space for teaching and learning activities, for example page 7 of the internal annual monitoring document for 2015-16 states that “the demands on clinical teaching space have reached capacity. Further measures will need to be identified to ensure adequate space for teaching and for student practice sessions” The same document also mentions

that “the IT facilities are still inadequate in some teaching rooms” (p8), among other concerns about resources that have arisen from feedback and quality reports. However, these changes were not flagged by the education provider in their SETs mapping document, and therefore the visits were unclear whether the changes were appropriate to ensure this standard continued to be met.

Suggested documentation: Documents to demonstrate that the education provider has a plan to take appropriate and effective measures to meet the resourcing challenges.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the education provider is engaging with the annual monitoring process and showing awareness of the need to address the issues identified around timetabling, resources and staff numbers. They are satisfied that the SETs are met at threshold for the last two academic years but wished to highlight that, looking forward, the education provider does need to follow through on addressing the issues of recruitment and timetabling in particular. The education provider should ensure that they highlight developments concerning recruitment and timetabling during future HCPC monitoring processes.

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	Brunel 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	Joanne Stead (Occupational therapist) Jane Grant (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of postal review	24 January 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
 - MSc Board of Studies minutes 2014 and 2015
 - PG OT (pre-reg) Programme Evaluation
 - Placement report form
 - Escalations of concerns monitoring
 - Email of SU involvement selection days
 - PG OT and PG OT (pre-reg) module block review 2014 - 2014
 - HH2709/OT5707 timetable
 - Mental health study day - timetable

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that the education provider has selected a new external examiner. However the visitors were unable to see, from the evidence provided, that the external examiner is registered on the relevant part of the HCPC register. As such, the visitors require evidence explaining the recruitment of the external examiner and why they are appropriate for this role in relation to this programme.

Suggested documentation: Information to show that this external examiner is either registered with the HCPC on the relevant part of the register or, if they are not registered, justification of how their selection is appropriate 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.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Brunel University
Programme title	MSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	18 January 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
 - Student handbook
 - Minutes of Board of Studies meetings
 - Module descriptions
 - Documents relating to service user involvement

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Reason: The visitors noted that effective timetabling had been an ongoing issue in the programme. This has been highlighted in internal quality monitoring as well as in student feedback. The internal annual monitoring form for 2015-16 states that “timetabling remains a severe problem” (page 7). The education provider’s response to this issue was not noted as a change in the mapping document submitted by the education provider. Other management issues identified in the submission include challenges raised by changes to course structure (page 3) and the effectiveness of internal quality monitoring (page 3). The visitors also did not see evidence of the measures being taken to address these problems. As the visitors were unclear how issues identified were being addressed, they were unclear how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Documents demonstrating that concerns over timetabling and other management issues will be addressed appropriately going forward, to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that staffing levels had been an ongoing issue for the programme (page 9 of internal annual monitoring), and that this is potentially adding to problems with timetabling and use of resources. Internal monitoring documents and past HCPC processes have highlighted this, although there were no changes flagged by the education provider in the SETs mapping document. As the visitors were unclear how issues identified were being addressed, they were unclear how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Documents to demonstrate that action is being taken to ensure appropriate staffing levels for the delivery of an effective programme.

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

Reason: Internal monitoring documents have suggested that there are ongoing issues around the programme’s use of space for teaching and learning activities, for example page 7 of the internal annual monitoring document for 2015-16 states that “the demands on clinical teaching space have reached capacity. Further measures will need to be identified to ensure adequate space for teaching and for student practice sessions” The same document also mentions

that “the IT facilities are still inadequate in some teaching rooms” (p8), among other concerns about resources that have arisen from feedback and quality reports. However, these changes were not flagged by the education provider in their SETs mapping document, and therefore the visits were unclear whether the changes were appropriate to ensure this standard continued to be met.

Suggested documentation: Documents to demonstrate that the education provider has a plan to take appropriate and effective measures to meet the resourcing challenges.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the education provider is engaging with the annual monitoring process and showing awareness of the need to address the issues identified around timetabling, resources and staff numbers. They are satisfied that the SETs are met at threshold for the last two academic years but wished to highlight that, looking forward, the education provider does need to follow through on addressing the issues of recruitment and timetabling in particular. The education provider should ensure that they highlight developments concerning recruitment and timetabling during future HCPC monitoring processes.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Brunel University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Guide to assessment
 - Consent to role play form

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Brunel University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Guide to assessment
 - Consent to role play form

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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 Coventry and University of Warwick
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin.Psy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) Richard Kwiatkowski (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	18 January 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
 - Updated admissions documentation
 - Revised Faculty organisation diagram and staff CVs for new staff
 - Updated Faculty Fitness to Practise policy
 - Range of documents to illustrate service user involvement
 - Updated and re-approved Academic Course regulations

Section three: Additional documentation

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

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: From the mapping document provided, the visitors noted that “the programme’s regulations were thoroughly reviewed and re-approved” in relation to progression and achievement on the programme. The visitors also noted a statement in the Quality, Enhancement and Monitoring Report 2014/15 that “(t)here will be some changes to the timing and content of some assessments”. However, from the mapping document and from reviewing the updated regulations, the visitors were unclear of the extent or nature of these changes in relation to progression and achievement on the programme, or whether there would be impact on other aspects of the programme, for example the information provided to applicants about programme expectations.

Suggested documentation: Information that specifies how these regulations have changed, where the education provider considers any changes will impact, and how they will manage any impact.

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 Quality, Enhancement and Monitoring Report 2014/15, the visitors noted that the programme will be accepting international students from September 2016. Although this is outside of the period considered by this audit, the visitors noted that this could constitute as a major change to the programme, and could impact on the way the programme meets several of the standards (for example, SET 2.2 (English language requirements), and standards around resourcing for the programme if there is an increase in student numbers).

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Information about service user and carer involvement
 - Flyer for film festival
 - Course handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Information about service user and carer involvement
 - Flyer for film festival
 - Course handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Information about service user and carer involvement
 - Flyer for film festival
 - Programme handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Information about service user and carer involvement
 - Flyer for film festival
 - Programme handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters exit route only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Information about service user and carer involvement
 - Flyer for film festival
 - Programme handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters exit route only)
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Information about service user and carer involvement
 - Flyer for film festival
 - Programme handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	The City of Liverpool College
Name of validating body	Liverpool John Moores University
Programme title	BA (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social Worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social worker in England) Patricia Higham (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	18 January 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 programme document for 2016-2017 the visitors noted on page 35, a statement that the service users and carer group provides volunteers who give guidance to students and assess elements of practical skills sessions. However the visitors were not presented with the evidence to support the statement that service users and carers are involved in the programme. Therefore the visitors require evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers were recruited, supported, involved and prepared for their role in the programme. The visitors will also require evidence to demonstrate how the service user and carer group is appropriate and relevant to the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence regarding service users and carers' involvement in the programme including information about how service users are chosen, supported, prepared for their role and how they contribute to the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	BA (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	25 January 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.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the internal quality report 2014-2015 that the education provider had made a change to one of the modules in year one of the programme. In the second semester of year one students will no longer undertake the generic law and practice module. This has now been replaced by the Social Work Practice and Law (Adults) and Social Work Practice and Law (Children) modules. The visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted. The visitors were unsure as to whether the law modules had changed substantially from the original law and practice module and were unable to determine whether there are any changes to the learning outcomes, and therefore the delivery of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the Social work practice and law (Adults and Children) modules, including the learning outcomes.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the internal quality report 2014-2015 that the education provider had made a change to one of the modules in year one of the programme. In the second semester of year one students will no longer undertake the generic law and practice module. This has now been replaced by the Social Work Practice and Law (Adults) and Social Work Practice and Law (Children) as separate modules. The visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted. The visitors were unsure of the whether the law modules had changed substantially from the original law and practice module and were unable to determine whether any changes have been made to the assessment of the learning outcomes, and therefore the achievement of the standards of proficiency (SOPs),. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation Further evidence about the Social work practice and law (Adults and Children) modules, including the assessment strategy.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	BA (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	25 January 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.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the internal quality report 2014-2015 that the education provider had made a change to one of the modules in year one of the programme. In the second semester of year one students will no longer undertake the generic law and practice module. This has now been replaced by the Social Work Practice and Law (Adults) and Social Work Practice and Law (Children) modules. The visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted. The visitors were unsure as to whether the law modules had changed substantially from the original law and practice module and were unable to determine whether there are any changes to the learning outcomes, and therefore the delivery of the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about the Social work practice and law (Adults and Children) modules, including the learning outcomes.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the internal quality report 2014-2015 that the education provider had made a change to one of the modules in year one of the programme. In the second semester of year one students will no longer undertake the generic law and practice module. This has now been replaced by the Social Work Practice and Law (Adults) and Social Work Practice and Law (Children) as separate modules. The visitors did not receive revised module descriptors and a major change notification form had not been submitted. The visitors were unsure of the whether the law modules had changed substantially from the original law and practice module and were unable to determine whether any changes have been made to the assessment of the learning outcomes, and therefore the achievement of the standards of proficiency (SOPs),. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation Further evidence about the Social work practice and law (Adults and Children) modules, including the assessment strategy.

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	Coventry University
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Radiographer) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Service user and carer engagement toolkits
 - Service user and carer group minutes
 - 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	Coventry University
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (Level 3)
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
 - External review document 2016
 - Course flyer
 - Programme Specification
 - Course application form
 - Course application process
 - Student handbook
 - Service user feedback form for portfolio
 - Service user feedback forms for OSCE assessments

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (M Level)
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
- Course flyer
 - Programme Specification
 - Course application form
 - Course application process
 - Student handbook
 - Service user feedback form for portfolio
 - Service user feedback forms for OSCE assessments

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
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
- Service user toolkit and induction programme
- Student Course Handbook 2016-17

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors in their reading could not see any direct evidence of the how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The education provider provided an over-arching toolkit document that talks about how the service users and carers should be involved in the programme. Therefore the visitors could not see how the service users and carers contributed to the programme in terms of being involved in assessment or interview panels. The education provider also referred to an induction programme but this document was not provided. Therefore the visitors require evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the Diploma in Higher education Operating Department Practice.

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	Coventry University
Programme title	Conversion Course From Supplementary to Independent Non-Medical Prescribing (Non-Accredited)
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
 - External review document 2016
 - Course flyer
 - Programme Specification
 - Course application form
 - Course application process
 - Student handbook

- Service user feedback form for portfolio
- Service user feedback forms for OSCE assessments

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (Level 3)
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
 - Internal quality report from 2013-14
 - HUB service users and carers reports and descriptions
 - Staff CVs
 - 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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (M Level)
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
 - Internal quality report from 2013-14
 - HUB service users and carers reports and descriptions
 - Staff CVs
 - 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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	Foundation Degree Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Radiographer) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Service User and Carer Engagement Toolkits
 - Service user and carer group minutes
 - 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	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Independent / Supplementary Prescribing (Podiatrists)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber) Gemma Quinn (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of postal review	13 January 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
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Standards of prescribing mapping document
 - Application form
 - Programme handbook
 - Teaching schedule

- Practice assessment document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: The visitors noted the replacement staff members and the accompanying curriculum vitae. However, from a review of the evidence provided for the programme team's specialist expertise and knowledge, they were unable to ascertain what support was available for podiatrists on the programme, and how they would ensure that the principles of independent prescribing would be contextualised to the role of a podiatrist. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that podiatrists will continue to be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate how the staff ensure that the principles of independent prescribing are contextualised to the role of a podiatrist.

C.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately identified and addressed.

Reason: The visitors noted the replacement staff members and the accompanying curriculum vitae. However, from a review of the evidence provided regarding the current programme team including new staff, they were unable to ascertain how the profession-specific skills and knowledge of podiatrists would continue to be adequately identified and addressed within the programme. As such, the visitors require further evidence in order to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence that demonstrates that the profession-specific skills and knowledge of podiatrists will be adequately identified and addressed throughout 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 Derby
Programme title	MA Art Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Art therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Philippa Brown (Art therapist) John Crossfield (Art therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	19 January 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
 - Admissions process changes
 - Profession related conduct process
 - Profession related conduct concerns notification form
 - Experts by experience minutes
 - Interprofessional learning conference notes
 - Module descriptors
 - Programme handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted the programme has an intention to increase input of Experts by Experience within the selection processes. The education provider has included documentation that refers to the 2016/17 Action Plan and the minutes of the College of Health and Social Care Experts by Experience committee have been included. However it is not clear to the visitors how the programme is currently delivering service user and carer throughout the programme. The visitors noted that in the Audit mapping document, it stated that service user and carer involvement was an 'unchanged process' and '*we have been building upon embedding this process further into the programme*'. From the submission there was not t any evidence to support these statements, as such the visitors could not determine the involvement of service users and carers on the programme. Therefore further evidence is required to demonstrate how service users and carers are currently involved in the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that clearly demonstrates how the education provider is currently involving service users and carers in the programme, including how service users and carers are developed and supported by the programme team.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme title	Practice Certificate in Independent / Supplementary Prescribing (Physiotherapists)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Rosemary Furner (Independent prescriber) Gemma Quinn (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of postal review	13 January 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
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Standards of prescribing mapping document
 - Application form
 - Programme handbook
 - Teaching schedule

- Practice assessment document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: The visitors noted the replacement staff members and the accompanying curriculum vitae. However, from a review of the evidence provided for the programme team's specialist expertise and knowledge, they were unable to ascertain what support was available for physiotherapists on the programme, and how they would ensure that the principles of independent prescribing would be contextualised to the role of a physiotherapist. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that physiotherapists will continue to be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate how the staff ensure that the principles of independent prescribing are contextualised to the role of a physiotherapist.

C.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately identified and addressed.

Reason: The visitors noted the replacement staff members and the accompanying curriculum vitae. However, from a review of the evidence provided regarding the current programme team including new staff, they were unable to ascertain how the profession-specific skills and knowledge of physiotherapists would continue to be adequately identified and addressed within the programme. As such, the visitors require further evidence in order to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence that demonstrates that the profession-specific skills and knowledge of physiotherapists will be adequately identified and addressed throughout 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	De Montfort University
Programme title	BA Honours in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Teresa Rogers (Social worker in England) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Assessment schedule (2016-2017)
 - BA (Hons) Social Work Admissions Handbook
 - Open day documentation
 - Course structure (2016-2017)
 - Practice Learning Portfolio
 - Practice learning handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Havering College of Further and Higher Education
Name of validating body	The Open University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Teresa Rogers (Social worker in England) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Business plan for 2017/2018
 - Organisation structure 2016-2017
 - Social work programme specification
 - Revalidation document April 2013
 - Staff curriculum vitae

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that the education provider had highlighted three individuals with the overall responsibility for the programme. In the audit form the education provider had mapped Meldene Elder, Olle Chima and Elle Thoroughgood as the people with the overall professional responsibility of the programme. The visitors saw curriculum vitae for 2 staff members but did not receive any evidence which demonstrates that Elle Thoroughgood is appropriately qualified and experienced and is one of the three members of staff with overall responsibility for the programme. The visitors therefore need to see evidence that demonstrates that Elle Thoroughgood is one of the named people who has overall responsibility for the programme and is appropriately qualified and experienced to take on this role.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate who the named, appropriately qualified and experienced people are, with overall responsibility for the programme

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in various documents, such as the external examiner's reports, internal quality reports and the response to external examiner's reports that some of the texts were outdated and old versions with newer editions were still in the reading lists. The visitors noted for example, that the education provider was using law texts from 2013. Additionally, in the education provider's action plan for 2014-2015 the education provider had mentioned that they would update their reading lists as an acknowledgement to the external examiner's comments by December 2015. However by September 2016 the external examiner had commented that the reading lists had still not been updated. The visitors need to see evidence that the education has reviewed their resources to ensure that the texts are up to date versions in order to effectively support student learning in all settings.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate up to date versions of texts are on the reading lists available to students

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 Hertfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 March 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 CVs
 - Documents showing involvement of service users and carers
 - 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.

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 Hertfordshire
Programme title	MSc Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Patricia Higham (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Brendon Edmonds
Date of assessment day	13 March 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 to meeting SET 3.17
 - Programme handbook
 - Module guides

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 Hertfordshire
Programme title	MSc Social Work (Step up to Social Work)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Patricia Higham (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Brendon Edmonds
Date of assessment day	13 March 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 to meet SET 3.17
 - Programme handbook
 - Module guides

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 Hertfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of postal review	14 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
 - Definitive module documents
 - Information regarding service user and carer involvement
 - Admissions timetable
 - Letter for service users about their role
 - Notes on focus group consultation with service users
 - Programme Committee Meeting minutes

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Mapping of new SOPs
 - Patient and Public Involvement Strategy and Action Plan
 - Details of staff changes
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - 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.

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 Hertfordshire
Programme title	MA Art Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Art therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jonathan Isserow (Art therapist) John Crossfield (Art therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	24 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
 - Service user feedback
 - Service user forum minutes
 - Exhibition presentation and poster for service users
 - Service user statement of intent documents

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 that the education provider has primarily engaged in three gallery exhibitions in collaboration with service users and carers, as well as the start of a forum with service users. The education provider has also listed a range of short and longer-term aspirational intentions to include service users and carers into the programme. However, it is unclear how students engaged with the exhibitions, and the relationship between the exhibitions and the students' learning has not been clearly articulated in terms of relating the exhibition to service user and carer involvement in the programme.

The visitors also received documentation relating to intentions of building on service user involvement in the programme. It was unclear to the visitors if any of the intentions to include service users has now been realised. Therefore the visitors were unclear what involvement and what support the service users and carers received in their involvement in the programme. As such, there is insufficient evidence available to confirm that this SET has been met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of mechanisms to capture attendance of students at the exhibitions and how this related to service users and carers in the programme, to determine how this is integrated into students' learning. Evidence is also required to demonstrate how the education provider has developed the relationship with the service user and carers for involvement of service users and carers into 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	University of Hertfordshire
Programme title	Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Step Up to Social Work)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Patricia Higham (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Brendon Edmonds
Date of assessment day	13 March 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 to meet SET 3.17
 - Programme handbook
 - Module guides

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 Huddersfield
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Revised module descriptor
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Programme specification
 - Standards of proficiency mapping
 - Service user and carer focus group document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Hull
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	25 January 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
- BA student handbook 2016-2017

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted in both the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 internal annual monitoring reports that due to the University's selective voluntary leaver scheme there has been a shortage of staff members to deliver the modules on the programme. The education provider has highlighted that although they have recruited a new member of staff for this programme, this is "only a partial cover for the staff lost and it is a fixed term contract". Furthermore, in the 2015-2016 internal annual monitoring report, the education provider highlights that there has been further reductions in staff members in terms of administrative and academic staff and this has had a further impact on the current teaching staff. The reports did not indicate how the staffing issues were being addressed. As such the visitors are unclear as to how the education provider ensures that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Further information about how the education provider ensures that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme including any plans to address the impact on the current teaching staff such as recruitment of new staff.

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 Hull
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Programme handbook
 - Clinical Placement document
 - Research document
 - Service user and carer involvement
 - Minor amendment to clinical practice examination document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Hull
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences (Life Sciences)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	18 January 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 and carer information, covering several areas.

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 education provider has stated that they intend to close the programme from September 2017. The visitors did not see evidence of how the education provider intends to ensure an effective programme for existing cohorts, in light of the staffing changes mentioned in section 2 of the internal annual monitoring documents for 2015-16. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how this standard continued to be met.

Suggested documentation: Documents to demonstrate that the programme will have a secure place in the university's business plan for the academic years 2017-18 and 2018-19 so that those who enrolled in the programme are able to complete it.

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

Reason: Internal quality documentation from the education provider states that a number of staff left the programme at the end of the 2015-16 academic year and that these staff have not been replaced. Therefore, as the visitors were unclear of the profile of the staff team, and whether staff student ratios were being maintained, they were unclear how this standard continued to be met.

Suggested documentation: Documents to demonstrate the availability of a sufficient number of qualified staff appropriate to the delivery of an effective programme during the 2017-18 and 2018-19 academic years, even after the programme is closed to new entrants.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that a high number of students have failed to complete the programme, noted in sections 6 and 14 of the internal annual monitoring document for 2015-16. Section 6 states that "progression within the programme is poor, with students opting for, or at times having no choice but to transfer to, Biomedical Science." Section 14 states that "[t]here were no students on the final year of the programme in [the 2015-16] session. Therefore, the visitors were unclear if the support available for students enabled them to progress through the programme, and therefore whether this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Documents to demonstrate that students on the programme have appropriate access to the resources to support student learning.

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Reason: The education provider's internal quality documentation (annual monitoring for 2015-16, section 6) states that the programme has had difficulty securing placements and that they were only able to provide sufficient placements because of falling numbers. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how the education provider will ensure that all students that remain on the programme will have access to practice placement.

Suggested documentation: Documents to demonstrate that, even though the programme will be closed from September 2017, all currently enrolled students have access to placements.

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: As noted above, the internal quality documentation for the programme showed a high rate of non-completion. The education provider's internal quality report states that "progression within the programme is poor, with students opting for, or at times having no choice but to transfer to, Biomedical Science." The visitors considered that this could constitute an issue around how and whether students were being appropriately supported and enabled to complete the programme. This was a particular concern because the Biomedical Science BSc at Hull is not an HCPC-registered programme and does not offer graduates eligibility to apply for HCPC registration, and because of the comments that students may have "no choice" but to transfer to this programme. The visitors were therefore unclear how and whether students were made aware of the consequences of transferring to a programme that is not HCPC approved, and whether students were able to progress through the approved programme should they pass the appropriate assessments.

Suggested documentation: Documents to demonstrate that students are being appropriately supported to complete the Healthcare Science BSc, and that those who transfer to other programmes can make an informed decision to do so in the knowledge that those programmes do not offer eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Hull
Programme title	Masters award in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	25 January 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 handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted in both the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 internal annual monitoring reports that due to the University's selective voluntary leaver scheme there has been a shortage of staff members to deliver the modules on the programme. The education provider has highlighted that although they have recruited a new member of staff for this programme, this is "only a partial cover for the staff lost and it is a fixed term contract". Furthermore, in the 2015-2016 internal annual monitoring report, the education provider highlights that there has been further reductions in staff members in terms of administrative and academic staff and this has had a further impact on the current teaching staff. The reports did not indicate how the staffing issues were being addressed. As such the visitors are unclear as to how the education provider ensures that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Further information about how the education provider ensures that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme including any plans to address the impact on the current teaching staff such as recruitment of new staff.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Hull
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	25 January 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 handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted in both the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 internal annual monitoring reports that due to the University's selective voluntary leaver scheme there has been a shortage of staff members to deliver the modules on the programme. The education provider has highlighted that although they have recruited a new member of staff for this programme, this is "only a partial cover for the staff lost and it is a fixed term contract". Furthermore, in the 2015-2016 internal annual monitoring report, the education provider highlights that there has been further reductions in staff members in terms of administrative and academic staff and this has had a further impact on the current teaching staff. The reports did not indicate how the staffing issues were being addressed. As such the visitors are unclear as to how the education provider ensures that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Further information about how the education provider ensures that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme including any plans to

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Institute of Biomedical Science
Programme title	Certificate of Competence (Non-accredited degree followed by Registration Training Portfolio)
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
- Registration training portfolio
- Guidance document for candidates and trainers
- Education and professional standards 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.

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 would like to remind the education provider that when sending evidence to demonstrate the standards for an audit that they review the evidence being sent and ensure that documents containing the names and addresses of candidates are redacted. The visitors were concerned that data protection and confidentiality was breached in receiving documentation that included names and addresses of candidates.

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	Institute of Biomedical Science
Programme title	Certificate of Competence (Degree followed by Registration Training Portfolio)
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
- Registration training portfolio
- Guidance document for candidates and trainers
- Education and professional standards 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.

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 would like to remind the education provider that when sending evidence to demonstrate the standards for an audit that they review the evidence being sent and ensure that documents containing the names and addresses of candidates are redacted. The visitors were concerned that data protection and confidentiality was breached in receiving documentation that included names and addresses of candidates.

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	Institute of Biomedical Science
Programme title	Certificate of Competence by Equivalence (Biomedical Scientist)
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
- Registration training portfolio
- Guidance document for candidates and trainers
- Education and professional standards 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.

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 would like to remind the education provider that when sending evidence to demonstrate the standards for an audit that they review the evidence being sent and ensure that documents containing the names and addresses of candidates are redacted. The visitors were concerned that data protection and confidentiality was breached in receiving documentation that included names and addresses of candidates.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	3
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	3
Section five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Institute of Biomedical Science
Programme title	Certificate of Competence (Degree containing the Registration Training Portfolio)
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Registration training portfolio
 - Guidance document for candidates and trainers
 - Education and professional standards 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.

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 would like to remind the education provider that when sending evidence to demonstrate the standards for an audit that they review the evidence being sent and ensure that documents containing the names and addresses of candidates are redacted. The visitors were concerned that data protection and confidentiality was breached in receiving documentation that included names and addresses of candidates.

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	King's College, London
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	Stephen Davies (Clinical psychologist) Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	31 January 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
- Constitution of the Selection Sub-Committee
- Quality Contract Performance Management Qualitative Returns 2015-2016
- Constitution of the Doctorate in Clinical Psychology Training Programme Committee
Trainee Feedback Form
- Clinical Case Presentations Feedback Form
- Team Work in Mental Health Information Sheet
- DClinPsy Curriculum Aims, Objectives & Lecture Lists
- Doctorate in Clinical Psychology Programme Specification

- IoPPN Celebration of Education Awards 2016 Newsletter
- Research Overview

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 Leeds
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	16 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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors considered on reading the documentation provided for the audit that the placement assessment form was updated in 2015 to meet professional requirements. There is a log to make it explicit the assessment of core therapeutic competencies in at least two models that has to be completed. The education provider has indicated that the evidence for this change can be found in the placement handbook. The visitors did not receive the placement handbook to review and therefore are unclear whether this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that clearly demonstrates the new assessment log operates to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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: : The visitors considered on reading the documentation provided for the audit that the placement assessment form was updated in 2015 to meet professional requirements. There is a log to make it explicit the assessment of core therapeutic competencies in at least two models that has to be completed. The education provider has indicated that the evidence for this change can be found in the placement handbook. The visitors did not receive the placement handbook to review and therefore are unclear whether this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that clearly demonstrates the new assessment log operates to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dawn Blenkin (Occupational therapist) Russell Hart (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Major change notification form
 - Revised module descriptors
 - Module specifications
 - Service user strategy

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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: When reviewing the audit documentation the visitors noted that some modules had been updated, including the revision of learning outcomes. The visitors reviewed the module specifications, however they could not determine how the revised modules allow the student to continue to meet the standards of proficiency for an occupational therapist upon completion of the programme. Therefore the visitors require additional documentation that demonstrates how the revised modules, including the revised learning outcomes ensured that someone who successfully completes the programme meets the SOPs for an occupational therapist.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how the changes made ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for an occupational therapist, such as a SOPs mapping document.

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: When reviewing the audit documentation the visitors noted that the assessment strategy for module OCCU 320 'Transition to a Newly Qualified Therapist' had been changed. The visitors reviewed the revised module specification, however they could not determine how the revised assessment allows the student to meet the standards of proficiency for an occupational therapist upon completion of the programme. Therefore the visitors require additional documentation that demonstrates how the revised assessment strategy and design ensured that someone who successfully completed the programme met the SOPs for an occupational therapist.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how the revised module assessment strategy and design ensured that those who successfully completed the programme met the SOPs for an occupational therapist, such as a SOPs mapping document.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic Radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Inter-Professional Education and Learning Strategy
 - Service user and carer lecture
 - Board of studies minutes
 - School of Health sciences admissions away day minutes

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that service users and carers are involved in the curriculum delivery and there are plans to involve service users and carers in curriculum design. The visitors recommend the education provider continues to develop their strategy for broadening service user and carer involvement throughout 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 Liverpool
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dawn Blenkin (Occupational therapist) Russell Hart (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Service user and carer involvement document
 - Minutes from Board of Studies
 - Email regarding Year three experiences
 - Lyndale newsletters
 - Interprofessional learning 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.

3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Reason: When reviewing the documentation provided as part of the audit, the visitors noted in the national student survey (NSS) concerns raised about access to the pastoral and academic support on the programme. The visitors did not note any response to this concern as part of the internal quality report. As such the visitors could not determine how the education provider has responded to these concerns raised about pastoral and academic support, specifically in relation to the effective use and availability of the support. Therefore the visitors require additional documentation to demonstrate how the education provider has responded to concerns raised through student feedback about the availability and effective use of academic and pastoral support.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how the education provider has responded to concerns raised through student feedback about the availability and effective use of academic and pastoral support.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Liverpool John Moores University
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Gemma Quinn (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of postal review	6 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
 - Programme guide

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted from the documentation that the level 6 Non-Medical Prescribing programme will be closing. The education provider is reminded that it should submit a programme closure form through the HCPC programme closure process as soon as this is confirmed.

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	Liverpool John Moores University
Programme title	Independent & Supplementary Prescribing (NMP)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Gemma Quinn (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of postal review	6 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
 - Programme guide

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted from the documentation that the level 6 Independent & Supplementary Prescribing programme will be closing. The education provider is reminded that it should submit a programme closure form through the HCPC programme closure process as soon as this is confirmed.

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	Liverpool John Moores University
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 7)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Gemma Quinn (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of postal review	6 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
 - Programme guide

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Liverpool John Moores University
Programme title	Independent & Supplementary Prescribing (NMP) (Level 7)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) Gemma Quinn (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of postal review	6 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
 - Programme guide

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Liverpool John Moores University
Programme title	Postgraduate Diploma Social Work (Step up to Social Work)
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Goemans (Social worker in England) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 January 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
 - External examiner's report year 2012-13; Response to external examiner's report year 2012-13
 - Internal quality report 2012-2013

This programme does run outside the academic calendar with intakes specified by the DfE. Therefore, instead of the last two years' reports/documents, the EE report and internal quality documents have been included for the previous two cohorts (2012-13 and 2014- 15). An official response to the last EE report has not been included, as no improvements or issues to be addressed were identified.

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted in their reading of the evidence provided that the internal monitoring report for 2014-2015 although stated as being included, was not in the documentation reviewed by the visitors. Also the external examiner report for 2014 -2015 did not include anything that the education provider considered needed response to. Therefore the visitors were unclear as to whether the programme has regular monitoring and evaluation and so were not content that this standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that clearly demonstrates that the programme is monitored and evaluated throughout the programme and especially 2014-2015 where the evidence was not included in the documentation provided.

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	1
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2
Section five: Visitors' comments	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London Metropolitan University
Programme title	Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 March 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	1
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 March 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	1
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London Metropolitan University
Programme title	MSc Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 March 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	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech Pathology and Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist) Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	14 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
 - Programme committee meeting minutes for 2015
 - Feedback form from clients/carers and parents
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Client feedback forms

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	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Psychology and Speech Pathology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist) Aileen Patterson (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	14 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
 - Programme committee meeting minutes for 2015
 - Feedback form from clients/carers and parents
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Client feedback forms

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	New College Durham
Name of validating body	Teesside University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social worker in England) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	25 January 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
 - Value based recruitment student feedback results
 - Information about service user and carer involvement

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation that service users and carers have been surveyed on their view of what makes a podiatrist in line with value based recruitment. From the evidence provided, the visitors could see survey results from the academic year 2014-15 and a statement that this has changed how students are recruited to the programme. However, the visitors could not see what changes have been made to student recruitment, how service users and carers continue to be involved in the programme, who these service users and carers are and why this involvement is appropriate to the programme. In addition, the visitors noted that service users are involved in student learning and surveyed on other areas of the programme. However, the visitors did not see any evidence to support this and they were unclear about how and why this involvement is appropriate. As such, the visitors require further evidence in order to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Further information about how service users and carers are currently involved in the programme. Any further documentation should include why this involvement is appropriate to the programme, why these service users and carers are appropriate and how service users and carers are supported in their 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	New College Durham
Name of validating body	Teesside University
Programme title	Certificate in Local Anaesthesia
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Prescription only medicines – administration
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social worker in England) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist, Prescription only medicines – administration)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	25 January 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
 - Value based recruitment feedback results

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 from the documentation that service users and carers have been surveyed on their view of what make a podiatrist in line with value based recruitment. From the evidence provided, the visitors could see survey results from the academic year 2014-15 and a statement that this has impacted on how students are recruited to the programme. However, the visitors could not see how this has impacted on student recruitment, how service users and carers continue to be involved in the programme, who these service users and carers are and why this involvement is appropriate to the programme. In addition, the visitors noted that service users are involved in student learning and surveyed on other areas of the programme. However, the visitors did not see any evidence to support this and they were unclear about how and why this involvement is appropriate. As such, the visitors require further evidence to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Further information about how service users and carers are currently involved in the programme. Any further documentation should include why this involvement is appropriate to the programme, why these service users and carers are appropriate and how service users and carers are supported in their 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	New College Durham
Name of validating body	Teesside University
Programme title	Prescription Only Medicine Certificate
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social worker in England) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist, Prescription only medicine – sale / supply)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	25 January 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
 - Value based recruitment student feedback results
 - Information on service user and carer involvement

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation that service users and carers have been surveyed on their view of what make a podiatrist in line with value based recruitment. From the evidence provided, the visitors could see survey results from the academic year 2014-15 and a statement that this has impacted on how students are recruited to the programme. However, the visitors could not see how this has impacted on student recruitment, how service users and carers continue to be involved in the programme, who these service users and carers are and why this involvement is appropriate to the programme. In addition, the visitors noted that service users are involved in student learning and surveyed on other areas of the programme. However, the visitors did not see any evidence to support this and they were unclear about how and why this involvement is appropriate.

Suggested documentation: Further information about how service users and carers are currently involved in the programme. Any further documentation should include why this involvement is appropriate to the programme, why these service users and carers are appropriate and how service users and carers are supported in their 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	Nottingham University
Programme title	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for PHs and CHs Degree level
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) James Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	8 March 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 feedback
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Module descriptor
 - Practice assessment document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Nottingham University
Programme title	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for PHs and CHs Masters Level
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) James Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	8 March 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 feedback
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Module descriptor
 - Practice assessment document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
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
 - Documentation to support service user and carer involvement
 - Module descriptors for several optional module

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 Nottingham
Programme title	Masters of Nutrition (MNutr)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Teresa Rogers (Social worker in England) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Admissions selection questions
 - Service user and Carer involvement policy
 - 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	Nottingham University
Programme title	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Physiotherapists, Podiatrists and Chiropodists (Degree)
Mode of delivery	Distance learning
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) James Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	8 March 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 feedback
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Module descriptor
 - Practice assessment document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Nottingham University
Programme title	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for PHs and CHs Masters level
Mode of delivery	Distance learning
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber) James Pickard (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	8 March 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 feedback
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Module descriptor
 - Practice assessment document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
- Revised module descriptors
- Service user involvement document
- Documents to support standard 4.9
- Documents to support standard 6.1

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	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Patricia Higham (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Brendon Edmonds
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
- External examiner report 2015/16 were embedded within in annual review reports
- Evidence to support meeting SET 3.17

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Patricia Higham (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Brendon Edmonds
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Evidence to meet SET 3.17

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted in the Annual Programme Review 2015/16 that an action plan was in place to further support students who were struggling academically after their first semester. These students were identified as having lower (but still acceptable) entry qualifications or English was not their first language. Whilst the visitors were satisfied the standards continue to be met and that a clear plan was in place to address this issue, any reoccurrence in a future audit submission may require further investigation.

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	Oxford Brookes University
Programme title	PG Dip Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Patricia Higham (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Brendon Edmonds
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Evidence to meet SET 3.17

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted in the Annual Programme Review 2015/16 that an action plan was in place to further support students who were struggling academically after their first semester. These students were identified as having lower (but still acceptable) entry qualifications or English was not their first language. Whilst the visitors were satisfied the standards continue to be met and that a clear plan was in place to address this issue, any reoccurrence in a future audit submission may require further investigation.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) in Social work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Blythe (Social worker in England) Patricia Higham (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
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
 - Social Work inclusion group minutes
 - Unit descriptors
 - 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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the same external examiners reports were submitted for both the BSc (Hons) and MSc social work programme. The visitors suggest that the education provider considers relating documentation specifically to individual programmes in the future monitoring processes.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme title	MSc Social work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Beverley Blythe (Social worker in England) Patricia Higham (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
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
- Programme specification
- Social Work inclusion group minutes
- Unit 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.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted in the internal quality report for 2015-2016 that the education provider will be removing the module "unit 23326" for the 2016-2017 academic year. The visitors suggest that the education provider considers reporting this through the major change or through the next annual monitoring process audit as this may affect the way in which the standards will be met.

Furthermore, the visitors noted that the same external examiners reports were submitted for both the BSc (Hons) and MSc social work programme. The visitors suggest that the education provider considers relating documentation specifically to individual programmes in the future monitoring processes.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Information about service user and carer involvement
 - Interview questions
 - Skills development day outline

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	1
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anne Gribbens (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Information about service user and carer involvement
 - Interview questions
 - Skills development day outline

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.

Major change 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	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of submission to the HCPC	10 February 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Susan Bell (Social worker in England) David Childs (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 4: Curriculum
 SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has proposed several changes to the curriculum and assessment, including changes to names of modules, content, learning outcomes and assessment methods.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- Module descriptors
- Assessment mapping document

- Skills development days
- Programme structure

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.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	18 January 2017
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Joanne Stead (Occupational therapist) Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3: Programme managements and resources

SET 6: Assessment

The education provider is planning to shorten the programme from 28 months to 24 months impacting on the programme management and assessment.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Education provider response to major change notification form
- Student handbook
- Agenda of placement discussion meeting
- Module Information Module Delivery Pattern for 2018-2020

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dawn Blenkin (Occupational therapist) Russell Hart (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	16 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
- Service user and carer strategy documents
- Curriculum vitae and HCPC registration details of Rupert Kerrell

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

When reviewing the audit documentation the visitors noted that the education provider, in response to the reduced staff numbers plan to change their approach to teaching and introduce a new teaching strategy. The visitors acknowledge that these plans are not finalised and therefore not able to be reviewed as part of the annual monitoring audit. Therefore the visitors remind the education provider that when these changes are ready for review, they should notify the HCPC via the major change process.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsychol)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Staff curriculum vitae

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the internal quality reports for both 2014-2015 and 2015-16 that there have been staff shortages on this programme due to various issues. The 2015-2016 internal monitoring report also stated that there were issues in ensuring feedback is given in a designated time to students or that students are kept informed of any unavoidable delays. Staff workload had increased due to the staff absences and there is a heavy reliance on external lecturers to deliver the programme. Therefore the visitors were unclear if, due to these issues, whether there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates that there are a sufficient number of qualified and experienced staff to deliver the programme, including an action plan on how this will be handled going forward.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the internal quality reports for both 2014-2015 and 2015-16 that the location for the programme is a continuing problem and the environment for the teaching of the programme is unpleasant. The visitors therefore are unclear as to how the learning resources are appropriate to the teaching activities of the programme and how the learning environment is effectively used.

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the small scale research project is taught by the research module lead. There were delays on feedback on proposals and or ethics and an action plan is in place for 2016-2017. The visitors advise that this should be kept under review and an update provided at the next annual monitoring audit.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme title	Doctorate in Educational Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kevin Woods (Educational psychologist) Andrew Richards (Education psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date postal review	21 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
 - Visiting lecturer schedule
 - Interview schedules
 - Evaluation forms
 - Trainee evaluation forms
 - Work file on service user and carer feedback
 - Family evaluation forms

- Educational service pupil evaluation form
- Small scale research project details
- BPS competencies log
- Whole day cohort equality and diversity forms
- Academic report on trainees and service users
- End of placement quality assurance form
- Report of casework feedback form

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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 Southampton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
Name and role of HCPC visitors	James Pickard (Chiropodist/podiatrist, 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
 - Report on service user and carer involvement
 - Protocol for service user and carer involvement
 - Statement on service user and carer involvement
 - Module profiles

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 Southampton
Programme title	Independent and Supplementary Prescribing
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
- Module profiles
- Minutes of Education, Validation and Approval Committee
- External Examiner details
- NMC Pin Registration
- Details of NMC Registrant
- University of Southampton EE Appointment Letter
- University of Southampton EE Role and Responsibilities document

- NMC Registration details for previous Programme Lead
- NMC Registration details for new Programme Lead
- Staff CVs
- Past Major Change notification form.
- Feedback form: Patient/service user/carer involvement in practice assessment for non-medical prescribing students.

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Staffordshire University
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Clinical Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	16 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

This programme has only run for one year since approval therefore evidence was only provided to cover this period.

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.

3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted in the audit form that there has been a temporary change to the programme leadership. No evidence was provided for the visitors to review the programme leader currently in place and evidence of the programme leader who has now been appointed. The visitors need to see evidence of the temporary and appointed programme leader to be assured that they are both appropriately qualified and experienced and on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates that the temporary programme leader and the appointed programme leader are appropriately qualified and experienced and on the relevant part of the Register.

3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Reason: The visitors noted in the annual monitoring report that the education provider had highlighted that there were still issues concerning the library and IT facilities relating to the programme. The education provider stated in the document (page 8) that the library resources are “barely adequate for the trainees”. The trainees are accessing library facilities at Keele University currently. The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates how the education provider are ensuring that the learning resources are appropriate to ensure that the students and staff can access the library to meet the needs of the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates that the education provider is ensuring that the library facilities are appropriate to the learning activities of 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 action plan for 2016-2017 that the physical resources for the programme are being upgraded. The visitors suggest that the education provider keeps this under review and reports any update at the next annual monitoring audit.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Keele University and Staffordshire University
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Service user and carer strategy
 - Service user and carer consultants' group terms of reference
 - List of service user teaching session
 - Selection group terms of reference

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted in the audit form that there has been a temporary change to the programme leadership. No evidence was provided for the visitors to review the programme leader currently in place and evidence of the programme leader who has now been appointed. The visitors need to see evidence of the temporary and appointed programme leader to be assured that they are both appropriately qualified and experienced and on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates that the temporary programme leader and the appointed programme leader are appropriately qualified and experienced and on the relevant part of the Register.

3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Reason: The visitors noted in the annual monitoring report that the education provider had highlighted that there were still issues concerning the library and IT facilities relating to the programme. The education provider stated in the document (page 8) that the library resources are “barely adequate for the trainees”. The trainees are accessing library facilities at Keele University currently. The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates how the education provider are ensuring that the learning resources are appropriate to ensure that the students and staff can access the library to meet the needs of the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates that the education provider is ensuring that the library facilities are appropriate to the learning activities of the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sunderland
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Patricia Higham (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Brendon Edmonds
Date of assessment day	13 March 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 to meet SET 3.17
 - Supporting evidence for institution wide and programme specific changes across a number of areas

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted the volume of documentation submitted with the audit. This was in response to a number of institutional, programme level and sector developments which influenced changes in a number of areas. Some of the changes were institution wide and should have been submitted via the major change process, in a more consolidated way which took account of the impacts across a number of programmes at the education provider. It was also difficult for the visitors to see the specific changes made to the programme based on the mapping document provided. In future, the education provider needs to consider how they can more easily facilitate a documentary review of the programme, and clearly highlight how changes have impacted the programme as part of the submission.

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 Sunderland
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Programme Specification
 - Module descriptor
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Staff responsibilities
 - Bioscience facilities
 - Bioscience facilities figures
 - Bioscience Patient carers public involvement (PCPI) strategy
 - Faculty strategy for PCPI
 - Programme handbook

- Audit tool

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 Sunderland
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Programme Specification
 - Module descriptors
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Staff responsibilities
 - Bioscience facilities
 - Bioscience facilities figures
 - Bioscience Patient carers public involvement (PCPI) strategy
 - Faculty strategy for PCPI
 - Programme handbook

- Audit tool

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 Sunderland
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cellular Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Programme Specification
 - Module descriptor
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Staff responsibilities
 - Bioscience facilities
 - Bioscience facilities figures
 - Bioscience Patient carers public involvement (PCPI) strategy
 - Faculty strategy for PCPI
 - Programme handbook

- Audit tool

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 Sunderland
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Programme Specification
 - Module descriptor
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Staff responsibilities
 - Bioscience facilities
 - Bioscience facilities figures
 - Bioscience Patient carers public involvement (PCPI) strategy
 - Faculty strategy for PCPI
 - Programme handbook

- Audit tool

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 Sunderland
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	13 March 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
 - Programme Specification
 - Module descriptor
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Staff responsibilities
 - Bioscience facilities
 - Bioscience facilities figures
 - Bioscience Patient carers public involvement (PCPI) strategy
 - Faculty strategy for PCPI
 - Programme handbook

- Audit tool

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Sunderland
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Patricia Higham (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Brendon Edmonds
Date of assessment day	13 March 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 to meet SET 3.17
 - Supporting evidence for institution wide and programme specific changes across a number of areas

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted the volume of documentation submitted with the audit. This was in response to a number of institutional, programme level and sector developments which influenced changes in a number of areas. Some of the changes were institution wide and should have been submitted via the major change process, in a more consolidated way which took account of the impacts across a number of programmes at the education provider. It was also difficult for the visitors to see the specific changes made to the programme based on the mapping document provided. In future, the education provider needs to consider how they can more easily facilitate a documentary review of the programme, and clearly highlight how changes have impacted the programme as part of the submission.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Surrey
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (PsychD)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Supporting Service User and Carer involvement
 - Service User and Carer Open Space Sessions
 - Selection policy

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors were content that the programme continues to meet the standards. The visitors considered that the education provider should keep under review the physical environment for 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 Surrey
Programme title	PhD in Health Psychology with Stage 2 Training
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Copies of webpages for Doctoral college;
 - Copies of webpages for Doctoral College Monitoring;
 - Copies of webpages for Doctoral College committees;
 - Curriculum vitae and webpage for programme leader

The external examiner's report and response for last year has not been included as no portfolios were submitted for examination in 2015/16. The external examiner's report and response for two years ago was considered at the approval visit in June 2015. This programme was approved in June 2015 so there are no documents to provide for the academic year 2014/15.

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University College London
Programme title	MSc Audiological Science with Clinical Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of postal review	23 January 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
 - Balance module timetable
 - Patient feedback forms

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 that service users with hearing and / or balance problems are utilised on the programme to inform students of their experience of the assessment and management of their condition. Furthermore, the visitors noted the education provider's plans to set up a service user and carer group as well as other plans to increase service user and carer involvement such as "further involvement with the National Deaf Children's Society and Action on Hearing Loss, using patient satisfaction questionnaires in training centres and students attending Children's Hearing Services Working Group meetings and Cognitive Behavioural Therapy / Tinnitus support group meetings". However, the visitors were unable to determine from the evidence provided whether the current service user and carer involvement is appropriate to the programme and how service users are supported in their role. In addition, the visitors did not see any evidence to support the education provider's plans to increase service user involvement and they were unclear as to how and when the education provider would implement these plans as well as why this involvement would be appropriate to the programme. Furthermore, they were unclear as to which elements of the service user involvement forms part of the education provider's future plans and which elements were already being implemented. As such, the visitors require further evidence in order to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Further information about how service users and carers are, and will continue to be, involved in the programme. Any further documentation should include why this involvement is appropriate to the programme and how service users and carers are supported in their 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	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University College London
Programme title	Postgraduate Diploma Audiological Science with Clinical Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of postal review	23 January 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
 - Balance module timetable
 - Patient feedback forms

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 that service users with hearing and / or balance problems are utilised on the programme to inform students of their experience of the assessment and management of their condition. Furthermore, the visitors noted the education provider's plans to set up a service user and carer group as well as other plans to increase service user and carer involvement such as "further involvement with the National Deaf Children's Society and Action on Hearing Loss, using patient satisfaction questionnaires in training centres and students attending Children's Hearing Services Working Group meetings and Cognitive Behavioural Therapy / Tinnitus support group meetings". However, the visitors were unable to determine from the evidence provided whether the current service user and carer involvement is appropriate to the programme and how service users are supported in their role. In addition, the visitors did not see any evidence to support the education provider's plans to increase service user involvement and they were unclear as to how and when the education provider would implement these plans as well as why this involvement would be appropriate to the programme. Furthermore, they were unclear as to which elements of the service user involvement forms part of the education provider's future plans and which elements were already being implemented. As such, the visitors require further evidence in order to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Further information about how service users and carers are, and will continue to be, involved in the programme. Any further documentation should include why this involvement is appropriate to the programme and how service users and carers are supported in their 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 East London
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social worker in England) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	25 January 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
 - Programme modification document
 - Subject area statistics
 - Review and enhancement process audit document
 - Module handbook
 - Module statistics
 - The stakeholder group extract from student handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted statements from the education provider about the different ways in which service users are involved in the programme such as admissions, teaching, assessment and the stakeholder group meetings. The visitors also noted statements in the mapping document about the involvement of service users in teaching and learning in the Readiness for Practice Module SK4201. However, from the module handbook, the visitors also noted several references throughout to “service users / actors”. As such, the visitors were not clear about whether these are service users or actors involved in the programme. In addition, the visitors did not see any evidence regarding how service users are supported in their role and they did not see any evidence of how service users are involved in the other areas of the programme mentioned by the education provider such as admissions and stakeholder group meetings and why this is appropriate for this programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about service user and carer involvement in the programme and clarification as to whether service users are actors or service users. Any additional evidence should explain and justify how this involvement is appropriate to the programme and how service users are supported in their 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 East London
Programme title	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social worker in England) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	25 January 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
 - The stakeholder group extract from the MA handbook
 - Subject area statistics
 - Module handbook
 - Module statistics
 - Programme review and enhancements forms

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 statements from the education provider about the different ways in which service users are involved in the programme such as admissions, teaching, assessment and the stakeholder group meetings. However, apart from assessment, the visitors did not see evidence of how this involvement is appropriate to the programme and how service users are supported in their role. As such, the visitors require further evidence of service user and carer involvement in the programme, how they are supported and why this involvement is appropriate for this programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about service user and carer involvement in the programme. Any additional evidence should explain and justify how this involvement is appropriate to the programme and how service users are supported in their 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	3
Section five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East London
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Counselling psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Sabiha Azmi (Practitioner psychologist) Richard Kwiatkowski (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	18 January 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
 - Policy for inclusion of service users and carers

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that there are several references to issues with numbers of staff on the programme, due to difficulty with recruiting and long term sickness. Particularly, the visitors noted the comment of the external examiner that “[e]nsuring a full complement of programme staff is... an immediate priority”. The visitors also noted that in their response to this external examiner, the education provider noted that they “are currently recruiting to ensure [they] meet the SSR specified by both the HCPC and BPS.” The visitors noted that the HCPC do not state what staff student ratios should be. Rather, we require that there is an adequate number of staff to deliver the programme. Considering the comments of the external examiner, the visitors did not see evidence that shows how the education provider would ensure they have an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff in the future, and therefore require further information to ensure this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence which shows how the education provider will ensure that they have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Reason: The visitors noted that there is a new MSc exit route for the programme, and that this exit point is called MSc in Counselling Psychology. The visitors noted that this exit award has a title which is close to the protected title of ‘counselling psychologist’, and were not clear how the education provider would ensure that students were clear that this award does not lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration. The visitors were therefore unclear whether this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that shows that it is clear to students that this award does not lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the programme had made several changes which are reflected in their internal quality monitoring documentation, for example changes to the role of the clinical tutor, support that is available for failing students on placement, and the recruitment strategy. However, the audit form was left blank for all standards with the exception of SET 3.17 (service user and carer involvement). Although many changes were incremental, and often quality enhancements, the visitors noted that the education provider should reference all changes that may impact on the standards in their HCPC audit documentation, so they can provide a rationale whether changes have impacted on the way the programme meets the standards.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East London
Programme title	Post-Graduate Diploma Social Work (Step Up to Social Work)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social worker in England) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	25 January 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
 - Module statistics
 - Module guide
 - Subject area statistics
 - The stakeholder group extract from the programme handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted statements from the education provider about the different ways in which service users are involved in the programme such as admissions, teaching, assessment and the stakeholder group meetings. However, apart from assessment, the visitors did not see evidence of how this involvement is appropriate to the programme and how service users are supported in their role. As such, the visitors require further evidence of service user and carer involvement in the programme, how they are supported and why this involvement is appropriate for this programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence about service user and carer involvement in the programme. Any additional evidence should explain and justify how this involvement is appropriate to the programme and how service users are supported in their 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 the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
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
 - Public and patient information (PPI) documentation
PPI_Haemoglobinopathy patient information assessment 2017
 - PPI_patient public involvement strategy for healthcare science July 2016
 - PPI_Pre placement week life sciences2016

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 the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
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
 - Public and patient information (PPI) documentation
PPI_Haemoglobinopathy patient information assessment 2017
 - PPI_patient public involvement strategy for healthcare science July 2016
 - PPI_Pre placement week life sciences2016

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 the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
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
 - Public and patient information (PPI) documentation
PPI_Haemoglobinopathy patient information assessment 2017
 - PPI_patient public involvement strategy for healthcare science July 2016
 - PPI_Pre placement week life sciences2016

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 the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Tissue Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
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
 - Public and patient information (PPI) documentation
PPI_Haemoglobinopathy patient information assessment 2017
 - PPI_patient public involvement strategy for healthcare science July 2016
 - PPI_Pre placement week life sciences2016

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 the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	Prescribing Principles (Level 3)
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
 - Internal quality report from 2013-14
 - HUB service users and carers reports and descriptions
 - Staff CVs
 - 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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	Prescribing Principles (Level M)
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
 - Internal quality report from 2013-14
 - HUB service users and carers reports and descriptions
 - Staff CVs
 - 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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	Principles of Supplementary 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
 - Internal quality report from 2013-14
 - HUB service users and carers reports and descriptions
 - Staff CVs
 - 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 for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dawn Blenkin (Occupational therapist) Russell Hart (Radiographer)
HCPC executive	Alex Urquhart
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Programme design consultation document
 - Involved newsletter
 - DAHP algorithm of involvement
 - PIPE useful guides and handbook
 - Public involvement landing page

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 the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	16 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
 - Scheme of work
 - Scheme of work involving service users
 - Algorithm for public involvement

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
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
 - Development audit 2014-15
 - Planning tool 2015-16

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Teresa Rogers (Social worker in England) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	16 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
- The HUB Group terms of reference
- Staff curriculum vitae
- Service user and Carer Involvement document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Major change visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Worcester
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	23 December 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 5: Practice placements

Overseas practice placements to be offered.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Practice learning document
- Learning environment profile
- Overseas risk assessment
- Essential standards of quality and safety
- Equality of Opportunity policy statement
- Staff CVs
- Practice education plan
- Practice assessment form

- Application for overseas placement
- International placement selection criteria
- Memorandum of understanding with placement provider

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that in Appendix 11, International Placement Selection Criteria, there is a reference to a Criminal Records Bureau check. The Criminal Records Bureau has now been replaced by the Disclosure and Barring Service, so this should be amended.

Major change 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' reports.....	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Worcester
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of submission to the HCPC	23 December 2016
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 5: Practice placements

Overseas practice placements to be offered.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Practice learning document
- Learning environment profile
- Overseas risk assessment
- Essential standards of quality and safety
- Equality of Opportunity policy statement
- Staff CVs
- Practice education plan
- Practice assessment form

- Application for overseas placement
- International placement selection criteria
- Memorandum of understanding with placement provider

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that in Appendix 11, International Placement Selection Criteria, there is a reference to a Criminal Records Bureau check. The Criminal Records Bureau has now been replaced by the Disclosure and Barring Service, so this should be amended.