

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Education provider | Academy for Healthcare Science |
| Name of programme(s) | Certificate of Equivalence, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 13 February 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12291-R4X0M6 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 3 |

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Ruth Ashbee | Clinical scientist |
| Stephen Boynes | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Amal Hussein | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Programme name | Certificate of Equivalence |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Clinical scientist |
| First intake | 01 October 2012 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 500 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07140 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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

Reason: From a review of the standards of education and trainings (SETs) mapping document the visitors noted that on SET 6.5, the outcome of the assessment process were previously ratified by the AHCS Education, Training and Professional Standards Committee. From May 2017, ratification transferred to the Regulation Council while a new chair of ETPSC was being appointed to reflect the regulatory implications of the decision made in the ratification process. A new chair of ETPSC has been appointed but it has been decided that the current arrangement will continue. From the information provided the visitors were unable to determine the implications of transferring to the Regulation Council and how this new arrangement ensures the measurement of student performance continues to be objective and ensures fitness to practise.

Suggested evidence: Further clarification of the implications of transferring to the Regulation Council and how this new arrangement ensures the measurement of student performance continue to be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Anglia Ruskin University |
| Name of programme(s) | FDS <i>c</i> in Hearing Aid Audiology, Distance learning |
| Date of initial assessment | 15 February 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12331-D0R0T7 |

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 5 of this report.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Hugh Crawford | Hearing aid dispenser |
| Tina Pyman | Arts therapist - Dramatherapist |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Programme name | FDS in Hearing Aid Audiology |
| Mode of study | DL (Distance learning) |
| Profession | Hearing aid dispenser |
| First intake | 01 July 2008 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 92 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07154 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

In the documentation provided, the education provider has highlighted a steady increase in learner numbers. The numbers have increased from 72 learners in 2015 to 92 learners in the 2016-17 academic year. From the information provided, the visitors noted that the education provider has identified some difficulty with providing adequate staff to support the increase in learners. The visitors noted that the education provider has an action plan in place which anticipates that there will be sufficient staff to support the programme by September 2018. The education provider will need to consider how they will demonstrate this has been achieved and that the standards continue to be met in future HCPC monitoring.

The External Examiner's report for 2016-17 identified that there has been cases where learners have not received adequate support in the practice-based learning environment in the workplace. The external examiner also noted that it is not possible under the current arrangements to audit the supervision of learners on their placement, and identified the importance to find a consensus with the employers of the very few supervisors which do not support their students sufficiently at the workplace. The

visitors understand that the education provider is aware of this, and has plan in place to monitor staff support for learners to ensure that staffing levels are adequate to provide sufficient support for all learners. In future HCPC monitoring processes, the education provider will need to consider how they will demonstrate that sufficient support in practice-based learning is achieved and maintained, and how they continue to monitor and evaluate practice-based learning in order to demonstrate how they continue to meet the standards in SET 5.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Education provider | British Psychological Society |
| Name of programme(s) | Qualification in Sport and Exercise Psychology (Stage 2), Flexible |
| Postal Date submission received | 08 December 2017 |
| Case reference | CAS-12283-C1M2G7 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation | 3 |

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Sandra Wolfson | Practitioner psychologist - Sport and exercise psychologist |
| Robert Stratford | Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Qualification in Sport and Exercise Psychology (Stage 2) |
| Mode of study | FLX (Flexible) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Sport and exercise psychologist |
| First intake | 01 January 2008 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 75 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07176 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Education provider | University of Essex |
| Name of programme(s) | BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 13 February 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12302-F7G5Z3 |

Contents

| | |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 3 |
| Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)..... | 3 |

Executive Summary

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

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

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 5 of this report.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Patricia Higham | Social worker |
| Niall Gooch | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| First intake | 01 September 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07237 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

The visitor would like to note that the HCPC does not appear to have been notified of the appointment of the previous programme lead, Janet Phillips. For approved programmes, the HCPC should be notified of all changes including changes to the role of programme leader via the major change process. This will enable HCPC visitors to make an assessment of whether that person is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on the relevant part of the register.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Institute of Arts in Therapy and Education |
| Validating body | University of East London |
| Name of programme(s) | MA Integrative Arts Psychotherapy, Part time |
| Date submission received | 09 January 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12335-S1Y3R5 |

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| John Crossfield | Arts therapist - Art therapist |
| Philippa Brown | Arts therapist - Art therapist |
| Jasmine Oduro-Bonsrah | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Programme name | MA Integrative Arts Psychotherapy |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Arts therapist |
| Modality | Art therapist |
| First intake | 01 October 2013 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07281 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. The visitors noted in the audit form that the education provider had filled out the last column, although there had been no changes to the programme. For future monitoring processes, if there have been no changes to the programme the education provider will not need to provide evidence. Filling out the "In which document / on which page of the document can this information be found?" section could potentially mislead visitors into making decisions about standards that have been assessed previously.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Education provider | Keele University |
| Name of programme(s) | BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 13 February 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12356-X6R8L6 |

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 5 of this report.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Patricia Higham | Social worker |
| Niall Gooch | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social Worker in England |
| First intake | 01 April 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07283 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

| Required documentation | Submitted | Reason(s) for non-submission |
|--|-----------|--|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes | |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | No | Internal quality document for two years ago is not included as only one internal audit has taken place for the School over the last two years. |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes | |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes | |

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

The visitor would like to note that the HCPC does not appear to have been notified of the appointment of the previous programme lead, Mo Ray. For approved programmes, for the time being the HCPC should be notified of all changes to the role of programme leader via the major change process. This will enable HCPC visitors to make an assessment of whether that person is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on the relevant part of the register.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Education provider | Keele University |
| Name of programme(s) | MA Social Work, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 13 February 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12337-L7Y1R5 |

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 5 of this report.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Patricia Higham | Social worker |
| Niall Gooch | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | MA Social Work |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| First intake | 01 April 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07287 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

| Required documentation | Submitted | Reason(s) for non-submission |
|--|-----------|--|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes | |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years | No | Internal quality document for two years ago is not included as only one internal audit has taken place for the School over the last two years. |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes | |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes | |

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

The visitor would like to note that the HCPC does not appear to have been notified of the appointment of the previous programme lead, Mo Ray. For approved programmes, the HCPC should be notified of all changes including the changes to role of programme leader via the major change process. This will enable HCPC visitors to make an assessment of whether that person is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on the relevant part of the register.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider | London South Bank University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time |
| Date submission received | 26 January 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12345-J7P2L1 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation | 3 |

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| David Bevan | Operating department practitioner |
| Joanne Thomas | Operating department practitioner |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Operating department practitioner |
| First intake | 01 September 2012 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07313 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Education provider | London South Bank University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Part time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Work based learning BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 13 February 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12367-V2V0H8 |

Contents

| | |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 3 |
| Section 5: Visitors' recommendation | 5 |
| Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)..... | 5 |

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Jennifer Caldwell | Occupational therapist |
| Angela Duxbury | Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer |
| Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2007 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 17 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07319 |

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study | WBL (Work based learning) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2002 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 4 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07320 |

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2008 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07322 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted in the 2016-17 internal quality report that there have been significant staff changes. The visitors note that four members of staff left the team and one member was recruited in the 2016-17 academic year. Furthermore, the visitors learnt from the documentation that for the full time programme there was an increase in learner numbers from 26 to 42 in September 2016. In the documentation submitted the visitors did not see any evidence of any plans to recruit more staff and there were no major changes submitted to highlight the changes. The education provider must therefore, submit evidence which demonstrates that the programme continues to have an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff to deliver the programme effectively.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the plans in place to ensure there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experience staff to deliver the programme effectively.

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted in the 2016-17 internal quality report that there have been significant staff changes. Experienced members of staff are no longer delivering the programme. The visitors did not see any evidence of the plans in place to ensure that the staff members who replace the previous members will have the relevant expertise and knowledge. The education provider did not previously highlight these changes to the HCPC. Therefore to ensure that the programme continues to meet the standards the education provider must demonstrate that the subject areas are taught by staff with the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the plans in place to ensure that the subject areas are taught by staff with the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors learnt that the programme over recruited learners for the 2016-17 academic year. For the full time programme there was an increase in learner numbers from 26 to 42. The education provider stated in the internal quality report for the 2016-17 that the “increased numbers presented rooming and placement challenges ... noted that the resultant additional workload has been absorbed by the academic team with limited additional resource allocation”. The education provider did not highlight these changes to the HCPC and did not submit any

evidence to support the changes. The visitors note that the increase in learner numbers has an impact on how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate that there are sufficient, appropriate resources to support the delivery of the learning and teaching activities of the 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: In the evidence provided, the visitors noted that the programme over recruited learners for the 2016-17 academic year. For the full time programme there was an increase in learner numbers from 26 to 42. The education provider stated in the internal quality report for the 2016-17 that the “increased numbers presented rooming and placement challenges”. The visitor also saw in the documentation that “particular challenges occurred in semester 2 in relation to sourcing and allocation of placements and this has been considered within the action plan for the next academic year”. The education provider did not highlight any changes to the HCPC or submit any evidence to demonstrate that there continues to be an adequate number and range of practice placement appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and achievement of the learning outcomes.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which demonstrates that there continues to be an adequate number and range of practice placements appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. From telephone conversations with the education provider and evidence provided for section 4, the visitors were informed that 42 learners will be recruited for the programme moving forward. The visitors reviewed evidence which demonstrated how the standards will continue to be met, with the increase in learner numbers. The education provider should inform the HCPC about any changes to the programmes once these changes occur.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Education provider | London South Bank University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 13 February 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12346-V4K5N9 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 3 |
| Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation | 4 |

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Angela Duxbury | Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer |
| Jennifer Caldwell | Occupational therapist |
| Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Radiographer |
| Modality | Therapeutic radiographer |
| First intake | 01 September 2007 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 14 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07325 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted in the external examiner report for the 2015-16 academic year that there were several comments and questions that were not answered. The education provider did not address the questions about feedback on the Radiotherapy Theory and Practice B. They also did not answer the question on whether the regulations allow a mark to be awarded in cases where there is a breach of confidentiality for example. The visitors saw no evidence in the response to the external examiner’s report and internal quality report for the 2015-16 academic year that these concerns had been addressed.

Additionally, the visitors note that part B of the external examiner's report for the 2016-17 academic year was missing as part of the submission and therefore could not determine what issues were raised and how they were actioned. .

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate that the external examiner's comments are adequately addressed to ensure that the assessment standards are appropriate. The education provider must also submit part B of the external examiner's report for the 2016-17 academic year.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Education provider | London South Bank University |
| Name of programme(s) | Pg Dip Therapeutic Radiography, Full time MSc Therapeutic Radiography, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 13 February 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12362-C1K6Z0 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 3 |
| Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation | 4 |

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Angela Duxbury | Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer |
| Jennifer Caldwell | Occupational therapist |
| Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Programme name | Pg Dip Therapeutic Radiography |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Radiographer |
| Modality | Therapeutic radiographer |
| First intake | 01 September 2007 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 8 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07324 |

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Programme name | MSc Therapeutic Radiography |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Radiographer |
| Modality | Therapeutic radiographer |
| First intake | 01 August 2016 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 9 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07326 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted in the external examiner report for the 2015-16 academic year that there were several comments and questions that were not answered. The education provider did not address the questions about feedback on the Radiotherapy Theory and Practice B. They did not also answer the question on whether the regulations allow a mark to be awarded in cases where there is a breach of confidentiality for example. The visitors saw no evidence in the response to the external examiner's report and internal quality report for the 2015-16 academic year that these concerns had been addressed.

Additionally, the visitors note that part B of the external examiner's report for the 2016-17 academic year was missing as part of the submission and therefore could not determine what issues were raised and how they were actioned. .

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate that the external examiner's comments are adequately addressed to ensure that the assessment standards are appropriate. The education provider must also submit part B of the external examiner's report for the 2016-17 academic year.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Education provider | University of Plymouth |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Part time Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) , Part time Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 13 February 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12368-J0D7H7 |

Contents

| | |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 4 |
| Section 5: Visitors' recommendation | 5 |
| Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)..... | 5 |

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Jennifer Caldwell | Occupational therapist |
| Angela Duxbury | Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer |
| Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2013 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 12 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07357 |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2013 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 6 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07358 |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2013 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 6 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07359 |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2013 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 12 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07367 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

| | |
|--|-----|
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |
|--|-----|

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted in the internal quality report for the BSc programme that “in comparison with the previous academic year the total number of enrolments increased from 176 to 203. We are unclear if these figures also include the MSc OT (Pre Reg) Programme”. From this information provided, the visitors were unclear, if the number of learners had increased or not and therefore could not make a decision on whether the programme continues to be effectively managed.

If the numbers did increase in the 2015-16 and 2016-17 academic year, this could have an impact on how the following standards continue to be met:

- 3.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.
- 3.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.
- 3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the 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.
- 5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Suggested evidence: Clarity around the number of learners for each programme. As well as evidence to demonstrate that all the programmes continue to be managed effectively. If the numbers have increased the education provider must provide evidence which demonstrates that standard 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.9, 5.2 and 5.6 continues to be met.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. The visitors noted in the internal quality report for the BSc programme that there has been a potential increase in learner numbers this academic year (2017-18). The education provider submitted evidence for the areas highlighted in section 4. In the future when there are changes made to the programmes the education provider should inform us through the change notification form.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Plymouth |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 13 February 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12455-R7R2K9 |

Contents

| | |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 3 |
| Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation | 4 |
| Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)..... | 4 |

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Jennifer Caldwell | Occupational therapist |
| Angela Duxbury | Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer |
| Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2008 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 60 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07361 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted in the internal quality that “in comparison with the previous academic year the total number of enrolments increased from 176 to 203. We are unclear if these figures also include the MSc OT (Pre Reg) Programme”. From this information provided, the visitors were unclear, if the number of learners had increased or not and therefore could not make a decision on whether the programme continues to be effectively managed.

If the numbers have increased in the 2015-16 and 2016-17 academic year, this could have an impact on how the following standards 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.
- 3.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.
- 3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the 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.
- 5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Suggested evidence: Clarity around the number of learners for each programme. As well as evidence to demonstrate that all the programmes continue to be managed effectively. If the numbers have increased the education provider must provide evidence which demonstrates that standard 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.9, 5.2 and 5.6 continues to be met.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. The visitors noted in the internal quality report for the BSc programme that there has been a potential increase in learner numbers this academic year (2017-18). The education provider submitted evidence for the areas highlighted in section 4. In the future when there are changes made to the programme the education provider should inform us through the change notification form

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Queen Margaret University |
| Name of programme(s) | Aptitude Test in Hearing Aid Dispensing, Distance learning |
| Date of initial assessment | 15 February 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12576-G4Q5W8 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation | 3 |

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Hugh Crawford | Hearing aid dispenser |
| Tina Pyman | Arts therapist - Dramatherapist |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Aptitude Test in Hearing Aid Dispensing |
| Mode of study | DL (Distance learning) |
| Profession | Hearing aid dispenser |
| First intake | 01 September 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07380 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Queen Margaret University |
| Name of programme(s) | Diploma in Higher Education Hearing Aid Audiology, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 15 December 2017 |
| Case reference | CAS-12464-S2J6C0 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 3 |
| Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation | 4 |

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|---------------|-----------------------|
| Richard Sykes | Hearing aid dispenser |
| Graham Noyce | Social worker |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Diploma in Higher Education Hearing Aid Audiology |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Hearing aid dispenser |
| First intake | 01 September 2009 |
| Maximum student cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07382 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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

Reason: From the visitors reading of the internal annual monitoring reports for 2015-2016 and 2016-2017, they noted that the staffing for the programme was impacted by the increase in learners numbers along with long-term absences of staff at critical teaching periods for the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear if there were sufficient number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme effectively. Therefore the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how the education provider will ensure that there are sufficient appropriately qualified and experienced staff for the programme should there be a further increase in learner numbers and long term absences of staff.

Suggested evidence: Documentation that will demonstrate how the education provider will ensure the staffing will be in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

Reason: From the visitors reading of the internal annual monitoring reports for 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 they noted that the staffing for the programme was impacted by the increase in learners numbers along with long-term absences of staff at critical teaching periods for the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear if there staff in place with the relevant knowledge and expertise in place to deliver the programme effectively. Therefore the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how the education provider will ensure that there are staff with the relevant expertise and knowledge in place for the programme should there be a further increase in learner numbers and long term absences of staff.

Suggested evidence: Documentation that will demonstrate how the education provider will ensure the staff will have the expertise and knowledge to deliver an effective programme.

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

Reason: From the visitors reading of the internal annual monitoring reports for 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 they noted that there was a report of rooms of insufficient size to accommodate the learners on the programme. The visitors were unclear if this is because there has been an increase in student numbers or the rooms are not of sufficient size to accommodate the students on the programme normally. Therefore, the visitors want to see further evidence that demonstrates how the education provider is ensuring that the rooms are appropriate to support learner learning for the programme.

Suggested evidence: Documentation that demonstrates the education provider ensures that the rooms for the programme are appropriately sized to support the learners learning on the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Education provider | Queen Margaret University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 13 February 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12575-G1K2D8 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 3 |

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Alison Wishart | Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration) |
| Joanna Jackson | Physiotherapist |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Podiatry |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Chiropodist / podiatrist |
| Entitlement | Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply |
| First intake | 01 October 1994 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07386 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors noted that in the internal quality monitoring reports 2015-16 and 2016-17 there had been a significant number of staff absences. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that there are an appropriate number of staff in place to deliver the programme effectively. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested evidence: Further documentation to demonstrate that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Queen Margaret University |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Diagnostic Radiography (pre-registration), Full time PgDip Diagnostic Radiography (pre-registration), Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 13 February 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12480-H1G7H3 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation | 3 |

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Ruth Ashbee | Clinical scientist |
| Stephen Boynes | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Amal Hussein | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | MSc Diagnostic Radiography (pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Radiographer |
| Modality | Diagnostic radiographer |
| First intake | 01 January 2012 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 8 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07398 |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Programme name | PgDip Diagnostic Radiography (pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Radiographer |

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Modality | Diagnostic radiographer |
| First intake | 01 January 2012 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 4 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07401 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Education provider | Queen Margaret University |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Music Therapy, Full time |
| Date submission received | 19 January 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12481-D7B9D1 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation | 3 |

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| Elaine Streeter | Arts therapist - Music therapist |
| Pauline Etkin | Arts therapist - Music therapist |
| Amal Hussein | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| Programme name | MSc Music Therapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Arts therapist |
| Modality | Music therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2015 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07405 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Education provider | The Robert Gordon University |
| Name of programme(s) | Non Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 9), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Non Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 11), Part time |
| Date of initial assessment | 13 February 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12406-V8Z2W8 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 3 |
| Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation | 4 |

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Matthew Catterall | Paramedic |
| Rosemary Furner | Independent prescriber |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Non Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 9) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 12 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07410 |

| | |
|----------------|-------------------------|
| Programme name | Non-Medical Prescribing |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Entitlement | Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 September 2007 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 24 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07412 |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Non Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 11) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 12 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07415 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

C.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Reason: The education provider has previously mentioned mapping of the curriculum to the Royal Pharmaceutical Society (RPS) Competency Framework for all Prescribers. The visitors note that the RPS prescribing framework was updated in July 2016. From the information provided, the visitors were not clear whether the education provider has mapped the learning outcomes to the revised RPS competency framework. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to determine how the programmes continue to reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge based as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance, such as the revised RPS competency framework for all prescribers.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate that the programmes continue to meet this standard, with respect to relevant guidance.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Ulster |
| Name of programme(s) | Pharmacotherapeutics in Prescribing, Part time |
| Date submission received | 19 December 2017 |
| Case reference | CAS-12424-J5G1F2 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation | 3 |

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Gordon Burrow | Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration) |
| Catherine Smith | Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – sale / supply) |
| Amal Hussein | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Pharmacotherapeutics in Prescribing |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Prescription only medicines – sale / supply |
| First intake | 01 November 2009 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07479 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Ulster |
| Name of programme(s) | Certificate in Medicines Management (Conversion to Independent Prescribing), Part time Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management (Independent and Supplementary Prescribing), Part time Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management (Supplementary Prescribing), Part time |
| Date submission received | 23 January 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12530-G2S1F4 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation | 4 |

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Alaster Rutherford | Independent prescriber |
| James Pickard | Chiropodist / podiatrist (Independent prescriber) |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Certificate in Medicines Management (Conversion to Independent Prescribing) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing |
| First intake | 01 February 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07482 |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management (Independent and Supplementary Prescribing) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 February 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07491 |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Postgraduate Certificate in Medicines Management (Supplementary Prescribing) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 February 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07492 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 March 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).