

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Anglia Ruskin University |
| Name of programme(s) | BA (Hons) Social Work (Cambridge), Full time BA (Hons) Social Work (Chelmsford), Full time BA (Hons) Social Work (Peterborough), Part time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12274-H2Q3T3 |

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:

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Richard Barker | Social worker |
| Tony Scripps | Operating department practitioner |
| Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work (Cambridge) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| First intake | 01 July 2003 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07141 |

| | |
|----------------|------------------------------------|
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work (Chelmsford) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |

| | |
|------------------------|--------------|
| First intake | 01 July 2003 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 45 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07142 |

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work (Peterborough) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| First intake | 01 July 2003 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07143 |

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 24 May 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) | DipHE Operating Department Practice, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12446-X2H0S9 |

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:

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Tony Scripps | Operating department practitioner |
| Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Programme name | DipHE Operating Department Practice |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Operating department practitioner |
| First intake | 01 September 2003 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 90 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07144 |

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 24 May 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) | MA Social Work (Cambridge), Full time MA Social Work (Chelmsford), Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12448-T6V1B9 |

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:

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Richard Barker | Social worker |
| Tony Scripps | Operating department practitioner |
| Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Programme name | MA Social Work (Cambridge) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| First intake | 01 June 2005 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07147 |

| | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|
| Programme name | MA Social Work (Chelmsford) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| First intake | 01 June 2005 |

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 45 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07148 |

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 24 May 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) | Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing (level 7), Part time Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing (level 7) (SP only), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing (level 6), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing (level 6) (SP only), Part time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12294-C3Y8B3 |

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 |

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:

| | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Alaster Rutherford | Independent prescriber |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing (level 7) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 4 |
| Assessment reference | AM07149 |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Programme name | Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing (level 7) (SP only) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary prescribing |

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------|
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 4 |
| Assessment reference | AM07150 |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Non-Medical Prescribing (level 6) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 4 |
| Assessment reference | AM07151 |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Non-Medical Prescribing (level 6) (SP only) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 4 |
| Assessment reference | AM07153 |

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 |
|--|-----------|---|
| HPCP 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 | No | We did receive two reports for the different years but they are identical for both years. It was therefore unclear if the second report |

| | | |
|--|-----|---|
| | | did refer to 2016 – 2017 academic year. |
| 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.

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

Reason: The visitor reviewed the evidence provided for this audit. The visitor noted that the content within the two external examiners reports were identical despite being dated as different years on the front cover of the documents. The visitor was unsure whether the documents did respond to different academic years. Therefore the visitor requires evidence that clearly demonstrates that there were two reports for the relevant years of this audit and that there were two reports received by the education provider.

On reading the annual reports for the programmes it was also indicated that further external examiners had been recruited to review the programmes for the last academic year. The visitor did not receive any further external examiner reports or responses from the education provider to those reports. Therefore, the visitor requires documentation that indicates that the reports and responses have been completed in order to be assured that the programme does have regular monitoring and evaluation in place.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that explains the duplication of the two external examiner reports for the period of this audit and also any further reports which supports that these programmes continue to be monitored and evaluated effectively. .

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

Reason: The visitor noted that there is a new person with overall responsibility for the programme. The visitor also noted the large workload this new person had. The evidence received regarding the person with overall responsibility did not include the further staff recruited to take account of the increased workload for the person with overall responsibility for the programme. Therefore, the visitor was unable to determine

if there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff to deliver effective programmes.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that indicates that there are sufficient staff in place to deliver the programmes and assist the new person with overall responsibility.

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 **24 May 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) | Step Up to Social Work PgDip, Full time accelerated |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12296-Q5B3X7 |

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:

| | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Richard Barker | Social worker |
| Tony Scripps | Operating department practitioner |
| Jasmine Oduro-Bonsrah | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Programme name | Step Up to Social Work PgDip |
| Mode of study | FTA (Full time accelerated) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| First intake | 01 January 2015 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07155 |

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 | Yes | The delivery of this programme is every other year. As such, only the internal quality report for the 2016-17 academic year was submitted. |
| 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 24 May 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 | Bangor University |
| Name of programme(s) | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin.Psy), Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12278-F9S0Z2 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Joanna Goodwin | Occupational therapist |
| Ruth Baker | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin.Psy) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Clinical psychologist |
| First intake | 01 January 1991 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 9 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07159 |

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 24 May 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 | British Psychological Society |
| Name of programme(s) | Qualification in Educational Psychology (Scotland (Stage 2)), Flexible |
| Postal Date submission received | 06 February 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12307-L0H3B3 |

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:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Robert Stratford | Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Qualification in Educational Psychology (Scotland (Stage 2)) |
| Mode of study | FLX (Flexible) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Educational psychologist |
| First intake | 01 September 2011 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07172 |

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.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the information provided in the internal quality audits did not make reference to stakeholder meetings, programme committees or systematic student feedback. As such, the visitor was unable to determine how the programme continues to deliver overall quality and effectiveness on an ongoing basis. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that there are processes in place to regularly monitor and evaluate the programme.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence to demonstrate the programme continues to have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

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 24 May 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 | British Psychological Society |
| Name of programme(s) | Qualification in Occupational Psychology (Stage 2), Flexible |
| Date submission received | 6 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12308-V0L0X4 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|---|
| James McManus | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Stephen Fisher | Practitioner psychologist - Occupational psychologist |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Qualification in Occupational Psychology (Stage 2) |
| Mode of study | FLX (Flexible) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Occupational psychologist |
| First intake | 01 January 2007 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 350 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07175 |

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 24 May 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 | British Psychological Society |
| Name of programme(s) | Qualification in Forensic Psychology (Stage 2), Flexible |
| Postal Date submission received | 19 February 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12552-T7X0J1 |

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:

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Kevin Browne | Practitioner psychologist - Forensic psychologist |
| Ruth Baker | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Qualification in Forensic Psychology (Stage 2) |
| Mode of study | FLX (Flexible) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Forensic psychologist |
| First intake | 01 January 2010 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 475 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07177 |

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 | Yes | |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | Yes | |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | No | The response was missing for 2016-2017. |

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.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the information provided in the audit form did not make reference to the sample of learners who had completed the programme, used by the external examiner for review in the academic year 16-17. As there was no response to the external examiner report 16-17 the visitors were unable to determine how the programme continues to deliver overall quality and effectiveness on an ongoing basis. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to

demonstrate that there are processes in place to regularly monitor and evaluate the programme.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence to demonstrate the programme continues to have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the external examiner report did not contain any information about the number of registered students that withdrew registration and the number of new registered students on the programme in the academic years 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. As this was not provided, the visitors were unable to determine how the programme has effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards of assessment. Therefore, as the visitors were unable to determine the sample size of registered students and new students the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that there are processes in place to regularly monitor and evaluate student progression throughout the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate the programme continues to have effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place.

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 24 May 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 | Bradford College |
| Validating body | Teesside University |
| Name of programme(s) | BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time BA (Hons) Social Work, Part time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12309-Q4J6J2 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|----------------|
| Anne Mackay | Social worker |
| Richard Barker | Social worker |
| Amal Hussein | 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 2013 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 17 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07178 |

| | |
|----------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| First intake | 01 September 2013 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 17 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07179 |

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 24 May 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 | Bradford College |
| Validating body | The University of Bolton |
| Name of programme(s) | BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time BA (Hons) Social Work, Part time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12284-D3Y9W2 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|----------------|
| Anne Mackay | Social worker |
| Richard Barker | Social worker |
| Amal Hussein | 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 October 2017 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 17 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07180 |

| | |
|----------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------|
| First intake | 01 October 2017 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 17 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07181 |

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 | This is a new programme and as such, there was no internal quality reports available. |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | No | This is a new programme and as such, there was no external examiner reports available. |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | No | This is a new programme and as such, there was no responses to external examiner reports available |

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 24 May 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 | Cardiff University |
| Name of programme(s) | Doctorate in Educational Psychology (DEdPsy), Full time |
| Date submission received | 4 May 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12285-X6T1L9 |

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:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Robert Stratford | Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist |
| Antony Ward | Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Doctorate in Educational Psychology (DEdPsy) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Educational psychologist |
| First intake | 01 January 2005 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07184 |

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 24 May 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 | City, University of London |
| Name of programme(s) | Independent and Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing Programme (V300), Part time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12288-C6L5T0 |

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:

| | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Alaster Rutherford | Independent prescriber |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Independent and Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing Programme (V300) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07194 |

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 24 May 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 | Cardiff Metropolitan University |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Dietetics, Full time Pg Dip Dietetics, Full time |
| Date submission received | 26 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12558-G9X0W8 |

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:

| | |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Pauline Douglas | Dietitian |
| Tracy Clephan | Dietitian |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|----------------|
| Programme name | MSc Dietetics |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Dietitian |
| First intake | 01 May 1997 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07208 |

| | |
|----------------|------------------|
| Programme name | Pg Dip Dietetics |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Dietitian |

| | |
|------------------------|-------------|
| First intake | 01 May 1997 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07209 |

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 24 May 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 Dundee |
| Name of programme(s) | Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 11), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 9), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 11), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 9), Part time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12295-X6M3Z1 |

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 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:

| | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Alaster Rutherford | Independent prescriber |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 9) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing |
| First intake | 01 February 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07212 |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 9) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing |
| First intake | 01 February 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07212 |

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Programme name | Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 11) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 September 2007 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 35 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07213 |

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Programme name | Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 9) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 September 2007 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 35 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07214 |

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 |
|--|-----------|
| HPCP 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 24 May 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 | Edge Hill University |
| Name of programme(s) | BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 13 February 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12299-D6L1M5 |

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:

| | |
|-----------------|----------------|
| 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 May 2008 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07218 |

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.

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

Reason: The visitor reviewed the revised standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping document, which the education provider had submitted to demonstrate how they would ensure that learners were able to meet the amended SOPs for social workers. With regard to the following SOPs for social workers in England, it was not clear to the visitors how the education provider would ensure that learners met them.

- **1.5 be able to recognise signs of harm, abuse and neglect and know how to respond appropriately, including recognising situations which require immediate action.**

The visitor reviewed the module descriptors mentioned under this standard in the mapping document. It was clear that this standard was addressed across the first two

years of the programme. However, the visitor was not able to see how the specific requirement that learners be enabled to recognise situations requiring immediate action was addressed in the third year modules mentioned in the mapping – for example 3008, 3010, 3011. The indicative content in those modules included references to harm, abuse and neglect, but not the particular skill of recognising such situations. The visitor considered that this might result in learners completing the programme without having had to fully meet this SOP.

- **8.6 be aware of the characteristics and consequences of verbal and non-verbal communication and how this can be affected by a range of factors including age, culture, disability, ethnicity, gender, religious beliefs and socio-economic status**

The visitor reviewed the module descriptors mentioned under this standard in the mapping document. These module descriptors had references to making learners aware of the factors mentioned in the standard of proficiency, but the visitor was not able to see how learners would be enabled, across the programme, to consider how these factors might impact on verbal and non-verbal communication.

- **14.7 be able to use research, reasoning and problem solving skills to determine appropriate actions**

The visitor reviewed the module descriptors mentioned under this standard in the mapping document. Some of these module descriptors had references to using research, reasoning and problem-solving, but it was not clear to the visitor how learners would be enabled, across the programme, to use research, reasoning and problem-solving skills to determine appropriate actions.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that learners meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) mentioned above, for example updated indicative content in the modules mentioned in connection with these SOPs in the mapping document.

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 24 May 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 | Edge Hill University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12452-Y3W6X5 |

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:

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Tony Scripps | Operating department practitioner |
| Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah | 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 2010 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 50 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07219 |

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 | 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 24 May 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 | Edge Hill University |
| Name of programme(s) | Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 6), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 7), Part time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12536-T9T3D1 |

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:

| | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Alaster Rutherford | Independent prescriber |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Programme name | Non-Medical Prescribing |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 July 2006 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 35 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07221 |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Programme name | Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 6) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing |

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------|
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07223 |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 7) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07224 |

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 24 May 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) | MSc Speech and Language Therapy (pre registration), Full time accelerated Post Graduate Diploma in Speech and Language Therapy, Full time accelerated |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12327-J0W7V1 |

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)..... | 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.

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:

| | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| David Abraham | Approved mental health professional |
| Lucy Myers | Speech and language therapist |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | MSc Speech and Language Therapy (pre registration) |
| Mode of study | FTA (Full time accelerated) |
| Profession | Speech and language therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2006 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 collectively for this programme and Post Graduate Diploma in Speech and Language Therapy |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07239 |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Post Graduate Diploma in Speech and Language Therapy |
| Mode of study | FTA (Full time accelerated) |
| Profession | Speech and language therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2013 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 collectively for this programme and MSc Speech and Language Therapy (pre registration) |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07245 |

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 | This document was not provided for the academic year 2015-2016 as this programme was not audited. |
| 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 24 May 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)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

From the information provided in the annual review of courses report 2016-17, the visitors noted that Health Education England has discontinued funding for postgraduate professional programmes, which is likely to impact upon recruitment for the programmes over the forthcoming years. As such, the education provider should be aware of the implications reduced funding could have upon the programmes in the future. The visitors would like to see that this aspect is addressed in future submissions to ensure the standards continue to be met.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Essex |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Physiotherapy (pre registration), Full time Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12303-P7R9Y5 |

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:

| | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Anthony Power | Physiotherapist |
| Kathryn Campbell | Physiotherapist |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Programme name | MSc Physiotherapy (pre registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07240 |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Programme name | Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2013 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07244 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes 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.

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

Reason: In the audit submission, the education provider has highlighted that the programmes are now part of the 'School of Sport Rehabilitation and Exercise Sciences' which formed in August 2017. The education provider has stated that the new school is a key part of the education provider's business plan, which includes the opening of a new teaching and departmental facility in January 2018. To evidence this change, the education provider has provided a link to the website which provides a general overview of the new School of Sport Rehabilitation and Exercise Sciences. From the information provided, the visitors were not clear how this change has impacted on the programmes. The education provider has referred to the business plan, however as the visitors have not seen this they cannot determine whether the standard continues to be met in light of the recent changes that have been made. Therefore, the visitors require further information in order to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: Further information on the how the programmes continue to meet this standard, considering the changes that have been made.

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

Reason: In the audit submission, the education provider has highlighted that the programmes are now part of the 'School of Sport Rehabilitation and Exercise Sciences' which formed in August 2017. The education provider has highlighted that this includes the opening of a new teaching and departmental facility in January 2018. To evidence this change, the education provider has provided a link to the website which provides general overview of the new School of Sport Rehabilitation and Exercise Sciences. However, the visitors have not seen information specific to the move of the programmes to the new teaching and departmental facility, and how this has been managed. As such, the visitors were not clear how the new teaching and departmental facility will ensure that the programme continues to have the resources to support student learning in all settings. Therefore, the visitors require further information on the change in resources for the programme, to determine whether the programmes continue to meet this standard.

Suggested evidence: Further information on the new teaching and departmental facilities, and how this change has been managed for the programmes.

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 24 May 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 | Glasgow Caledonian University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12537-V6B3Y1 |

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:

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Linda Mutema | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Radiographer |
| Modality | Diagnostic radiographer |
| First intake | 01 September 2009 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07250 |

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 24 May 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 | Glasgow Caledonian University |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12330-K3V4W1 |

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:

| | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Anthony Power | Physiotherapist |
| Kathryn Campbell | Physiotherapist |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Programme name | MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2009 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 44 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07251 |

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 24 May 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 | Glasgow Caledonian University |
| Name of programme(s) | Non-Medical Prescribing SCQF Level 10, Part time Non-Medical Prescribing SCQF Level 11, Part time Non-Medical Prescribing SCQF Level 9, Part time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12349-Y1D1P0 |

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:

| | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Alaster Rutherford | Independent prescriber |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Non-Medical Prescribing SCQF Level 10 |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07260 |

| | |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|
| 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 10 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07261 |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| 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 10 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07262 |

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 24 May 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 | Glasgow Caledonian University |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12539-H2M2D4 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Joanna Goodwin | Occupational therapist |
| Ruth Baker | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 August 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07264 |

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 24 May 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 | Glasgow Caledonian University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12350-W3S2C5 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Joanna Goodwin | Occupational therapist |
| Ruth Baker | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Mandy Hargood | 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 1996 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 75 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07265 |

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 24 May 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 | Glasgow Caledonian University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time |
| Date submission received | 26 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12325-G1F1V0 |

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:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Catherine Smith | Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration) Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – sale / supply) |
| Sharon Wiener-Ogilvie | Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration) |
| Mandy Hargood | 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 January 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |

| | |
|----------------------|---------|
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07266 |

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 24 May 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 | Glasgow Caledonian University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12541-F6G7D8 |

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:

| | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Anthony Power | Physiotherapist |
| Kathryn Campbell | Physiotherapist |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 August 1997 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 78 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07267 |

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 24 May 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 | Keele University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (with international year), Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12358-H0D2X3 |

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:

| | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Anthony Power | Physiotherapist |
| Kathryn Campbell | Physiotherapist |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 October 1996 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 80 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07286 |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (with international year) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2019 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 80 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07289 |

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 24 May 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 | Leeds Beckett University |
| Name of programme(s) | Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professions, Part time Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professions, Part time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12361-G5T8D6 |

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:

| | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Alaster Rutherford | Independent prescriber |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professions |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing |
| First intake | 01 May 2015 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07294 |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Programme name | Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professions |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary prescribing |

| | |
|------------------------|-------------|
| First intake | 01 May 2015 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07295 |

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 24 May 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 | Leeds Beckett University |
| Name of programme(s) | BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12340-K0S4J1 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|----------------|
| Anne Mackay | Social worker |
| Richard Barker | Social worker |
| Amal Hussein | 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 50 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07296 |

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 24 May 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 | Leeds Beckett University |
| Name of programme(s) | MA Social Work, Full time PG Diploma in Social Work, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12532-N4T5M5 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|----------------|
| Anne Mackay | Social worker |
| Richard Barker | Social worker |
| Amal Hussein | 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 10 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07297 |

| | |
|----------------|---------------------------|
| Programme name | PG Diploma in Social Work |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |

| | |
|------------------------|---------------|
| First intake | 01 April 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07298 |

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 24 May 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 | Leeds Beckett University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12363-Z9W4M7 |

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:

| | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Anthony Power | Physiotherapist |
| Kathryn Campbell | Physiotherapist |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 September 1995 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 33 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07299 |

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 24 May 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 | Leeds Beckett University |
| Name of programme(s) | MA Art Psychotherapy Practice, Full time MA Art Psychotherapy Practice, Part time |
| Date submission received | 10 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12341-F5F0P6 |

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:

| | |
|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Jonathan Isserow | Arts therapist - Art therapist |
| Julie Allan | Arts therapist - Art therapist |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Programme name | MA Art Psychotherapy Practice |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Arts therapist |
| Modality | Art therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07300 |

| | |
|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Programme name | MA Art Psychotherapy Practice |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| Profession | Arts therapist |
| Modality | Art therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07301 |

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 24 May 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 | Leeds Beckett University |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time Pg Dip Occupational Therapy, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12533-C3V6T0 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Joanna Goodwin | Occupational therapist |
| Ruth Baker | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2005 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07302 |

| | |
|----------------|-----------------------------|
| Programme name | Pg Dip Occupational Therapy |
|----------------|-----------------------------|

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 March 2011 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 16 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07306 |

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 24 May 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 | Leeds Beckett University |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time Pg Dip Physiotherapy, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12364-H8P2L7 |

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:

| | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Anthony Power | Physiotherapist |
| Kathryn Campbell | Physiotherapist |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Programme name | MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 February 2005 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07303 |

| | |
|----------------|----------------------|
| Programme name | Pg Dip Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| First intake | 01 September 2011 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07307 |

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 24 May 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 | Leeds Beckett University |
| Name of programme(s) | Postgraduate Certificate Mental Health Practice, Part time |
| Day Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12534-K6F8H8 |

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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes (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 Abraham | Approved mental health professional |
| Lucy Myers | Speech and language therapist |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Postgraduate Certificate Mental Health Practice |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Approved mental health professional |
| First intake | 01 January 2013 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07305 |

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 24 May 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 | Edinburgh Napier University |
| Name of programme(s) | Radiographer Supplementary Prescriber, Part time Non Medical Prescribing for Nurses Midwives and Allied Health Professionals, Part time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12463-X1R3Q1 |

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:

| | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Alaster Rutherford | Independent prescriber |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Programme name | Radiographer Supplementary Prescriber |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 5 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07331 |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Programme name | Non Medical Prescribing for Nurses Midwives and Allied Health Professionals |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing |

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| | Supplementary Prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07332 |

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 | Yes | |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | No | Despite the education provider chasing the external examiner, a report for 2016 – 2017 was not received. They have provided further evidence in the form of module assessments reviewed by the external examiner as evidence of evaluation of the programme. |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | No | As above. |

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 24 May 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 | Northumbria University at Newcastle |
| Name of programme(s) | Prescribing for Non-Medical Health Professionals, Part time Prescribing for Non Medical Health Professionals, Part time Prescribing for Non Medical Health Professionals, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12391-J0L0P6 |

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:

| | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Alaster Rutherford | Independent prescriber |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Prescribing for Non-Medical Health Professionals |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing |
| First intake | 01 February 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 45 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07334 |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Programme name | Prescribing for Non Medical Health Professionals |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary prescribing |

| | |
|------------------------|---------------|
| First intake | 01 April 2006 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07342 |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Prescribing for Non Medical Health Professionals |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Entitlement | Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake | 01 April 2006 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07343 |

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 24 May 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 | Northumbria University at Newcastle |
| Name of programme(s) | Post Graduate Certificate Approved Mental Health Professional, Part time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12375-H1H2W3 |

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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes (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 Abrahart | Approved mental health professional |
| Lucy Myers | Speech and language therapist |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Post Graduate Certificate Approved Mental Health Professional |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Approved mental health professional |
| First intake | 01 August 2009 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07337 |

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 24 May 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 | Northumbria University at Newcastle |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 23 March 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12445-Z0R5J4 |

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 |

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 Ariu | Occupational therapist |
| David Bevan | Operating department practitioner |
| Amal Hussein | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 May 1995 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 60 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07341 |

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 | Yes | |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | No | The education provider has provided the external examiner report for the MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) for 2015–16 as opposed to the external examiner report for the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy. |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | No | The education provider has provided the response to the external examiner report for the MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) for 2015–16 as opposed to the external examiner report for the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy. |

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.

Condition: From a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring submission, the visitors noted that there were references to departmental restructure which was causing a number of concerns on the programme. For example, 'ongoing interruption in activities due to departmental restructure and a time of pressure on staffing due to staff leaving the university and long term sickness' has meant that staff are unable to engage with continuing professional and research development. In addition, the visitors noted that the restructure has resulted in changes to staff in particular the appointment of two further 'doctor ally' qualified staff; however, the visitors were unable to determine what this role entailed. The visitors were not provided with any evidence of the restructure and what impact, if any, this has had on how the programme is managed. As such, the visitors were unable to determine whether the programme continues to be effectively managed.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence of how the departmental restructure has impacted how this programme is managed. In particular, a clear outline of roles and responsibilities of everyone involved in the management and delivery of the programme.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided for this annual monitoring submission that the external examiner report (2015–16) and the response to the external examiner report (2015–16) was for the MSc Occupational Therapy instead of the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy. The visitors could not, therefore, find evidence that the programme has engaged in regular and effective monitoring in 2015–16. As such the visitors require further evidence to this standard.

Suggested evidence: The external examiner report for 2015–16 and the response to the examiner response 2015–16 for the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy.

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided for this annual monitoring submission that the programme evaluation documents 2015–16 and 2016–17 highlights concerns around how staff engage with continuing professional and research development. Noting in particular, that this is due to 'ongoing interruption in activities due to departmental restructure and a time of pressure on staffing due to staff leaving the university and long term sickness' that staff are unable to engage with continuing professional and research development. From the documentation, the visitors could not determine how the education provider has responded to this concern. The visitors could not, therefore, find evidence that the programme team had taken action in response to the concern that staff are unable to engage with continuing professional and research development. As such the visitors require further evidence to this standard.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence that the concerns raised relating to how staff engage with continuing professional and research development has been resolved.

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

Condition: The visitors noted in the documentation provided for this annual monitoring submission that the programme evaluation documents 2015–16 and 2016 –17 states, “there has been some issues with the administration relating to placement – this has coincided with a restructure of student support system and as such is see as an action plan for the coming year”. From the documentation, the visitors could not determine how the education provider has responded to this concern. The visitors could not therefore find evidence that the programme team has taken action in response to this concern and the programme continues to have effective resources in place to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. As such the visitors require further evidence to this standard.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence that the concern raised relating to issues with the administration of placements has been resolved.

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 24 May 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 | Northumbria University at Newcastle |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 23 March 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12447-X3B0Q3 |

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 |

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 Ariu | Occupational therapist |
| David Bevan | Operating department practitioner |
| Amal Hussein | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2003 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 60 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07345 |

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 |
|---|-----------|--|
| 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 | No | The education provider has provided the external examiner report for the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy for 2015–16 as opposed to the external examiner report for the MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration). |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | No | The education provider has provided the response to external examiner report for the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy for 2015–16 as opposed to the external examiner report for the MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration). |

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.

Condition: From a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring submission, the visitors noted that there was references to departmental restructure which was causing a number of concerns on the programme. For example, 'ongoing interruption in activities due to departmental restructure and a time of pressure on staffing due to staff leaving the university and long term sickness' has meant that staff are unable to engage with continuing professional and research development. In addition, the visitors noted that "there has been some issues with the administration relating to placement – this has coincided with a restructure of student support system and as such is seen as an action plan for the coming year". From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provided has responded to this concern. As such, the visitors were unclear whether the programme continues to be effectively managed, in particular the visitors were unclear whether the departmental restructure has had any impact on how the programme is managed.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence of how the departmental restructure has impacted how this programme is managed. In particular, a clear outline of roles and responsibilities of everyone involved in the management and delivery of the programme.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided for this annual monitoring submission that the external examiner report (2015–16) and the response to the external examiner report (2015–16) was for the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy instead of the MSc Occupational Therapy. The visitors could not, therefore, find evidence that the programme has engaged in regular and effective monitoring in 2015– 16. As such, the visitors require further evidence to this standard

Suggested evidence: The external examiner report for 2015–16 and the response to the external examiner report 2015–16 for the MSc Occupational Therapy.

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided for this annual monitoring submission that the programme evaluation documents 2015–16 and 2016 –17 highlights that there may be concerns around how staff engage with continuing professional and research development. Noting in particular, that this is due to 'ongoing interruption in activities due to departmental restructure and a time of pressure on staffing due to staff leaving the university and long term sickness' staff have been unable to engage with continuing professional and research development. From the documentation, the visitors could not determine how the education provider has responded to this concern. The visitors could not therefore, find evidence that the programme team had taken action in response to this concern that staff are unable to engage with continuing professional and research development. As such, the visitors require further evidence to this standard.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence that the concerns raised relating to how staff engage with continuing professional and research development has been resolved.

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

Condition: The visitors noted in the documentation provided for this annual monitoring submission that the programme evaluation documents 2015 –16 and 2016 –17 states, “there has been some issues with the administration relating to placement – this has coincided with a restructure of student support system and as such is seen as an action plan for the coming year”. From the documentation, the visitors could not determine how the education provided has responded to this concern. The visitors could not therefore; find evidence that the programme team had taken action in response to this concern and the programme continues to have effective resources in place to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. As such, the visitors require further evidence to this standard.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence that the concern raised relating to issues with the administration of placements has been resolved.

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 24 May 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) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12476-C6G3V1 |

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:

| | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| David Abraham | Approved mental health professional |
| Lucy Myers | Speech and language therapist |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Speech and language therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2003 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 185 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07388 |

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 24 May 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)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

From the information provided in the response to the external examiner report 2016/2017 the visitors noted that the education provider has been asked to review the number of re-sit opportunities especially in relation to clinical placement when they are revalidated in 2018/19. As such, the education provider should be aware of the implications this could have upon the programme in the future. The visitors would like to see that this aspect is addressed in future submissions to ensure the standard continues to be met.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Queen Margaret University |
| Name of programme(s) | PgDip Radiotherapy and Oncology, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 March 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12395-L0F1W8 |

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:

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Helen White | Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer |
| Shaaron Pratt | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Niall Gooch | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name | PgDip Radiotherapy and Oncology |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Radiographer |
| Modality | Therapeutic radiographer |
| First intake | 01 September 2003 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 12 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07396 |

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: The visitors noted that the internal monitoring document for 2016-17 highlighted issues with staff numbers and the ability of staff to cover all the duties required of them. The report notes that "...additional workload has been created with no additional staffing. At the validation in 2016 it was requested that staffing levels were closely monitored to ensure quality is maintained...The academic team have been unable to further develop research." The 2015-16 report mentioned a "huge increase" in admissions numbers. Taking these two issues into account, the visitors were not able to be sure that an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff were

in place to deliver an effective programme. It was not clear how the education provider were ensuring this. They also noted that the HCPC did not appear to have been notified of the increase in learner numbers, and it was not clear to them how large the cohort now was.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to clarify how many learners are now on each year of the programme, and to demonstrate how, in light of the increase in learner numbers and the additional workloads for staff, the education provider ensures that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective 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: The visitors noted from internal quality monitoring documents that there had been a “huge increase” in learner numbers in 2015-16, and that this had led to difficulties in finding sufficient practice-based learning for all learners. They were aware that some of the extra learners had been accommodated in a placement in Galway in the Republic of Ireland. However, it was not clear to the visitors that the Galway placements represented a permanent solution to the issues with finding appropriate practice-based learning for all learners. The report states that “due to staffing levels and time constraints the programme team have been unable to move forward with [establishing Galway as a permanent placement site] apart from initial application forms and information gathering”. They were also unable to see how many learners were on each year of the programme (see the request for further evidence under SET 3.5 above). Given the issues noted above, the visitors could not determine how the education provider would ensure an appropriate number, duration and range of practice placements for all learners.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence showing how the education provider ensures that all learners on the programme have access to an appropriate number, duration and range of placements to support the delivery of 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 24 May 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 (pre registration) in Speech and Language Therapy, Full time MSc (pre registration) in Speech and Language Therapy, Part time Post Graduate Diploma (pre-registration) in Speech and Language Therapy, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12396-K2L2B3 |

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)..... | 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.

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:

| | |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|
| David Abrahart | Approved mental health professional |
| Lucy Myers | Speech and language therapist |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | MSc (pre registration) in Speech and Language Therapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Speech and language therapist |
| First intake | 01 August 2010 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07399 |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | MSc (pre registration) in Speech and Language Therapy |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Speech and language therapist |
| First intake | 01 August 2010 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07400 |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Post Graduate Diploma (pre-registration) in Speech and Language Therapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Speech and language therapist |
| First intake | 01 August 2010 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07403 |

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 25 May 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)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

From the information provided in the response to the external examiner report 2016/2017 the visitors noted that the education provider has been asked to review the number of re-sit opportunities especially in relation to clinical placement when they are revalidated in 2018/19. As such, the education provider should be aware of the implications this could have upon the programme in the future. The visitors would like to see that this aspect is addressed in future submissions to ensure the standard continues to be met.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Roehampton University |
| Name of programme(s) | PsychD in Counselling Psychology, Full time PsychD in Counselling Psychology, Part time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12485-W6V4Q0 |

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:

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Ian Davies | Biomedical scientist |
| Jai Shree Adhyaru | Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Programme name | PsychD in Counselling Psychology |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Counselling psychologist |
| First intake | 01 January 2007 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07423 |

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Programme name | PsychD in Counselling Psychology |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Counselling psychologist |
| First intake | 01 September 2017 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07424 |

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 24 May 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 Strathclyde |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Pathology, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12416-T9R3P6 |

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 |

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 Abraham | Approved mental health professional |
| Lucy Myers | Speech and language therapist |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Pathology |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Speech and language therapist |
| First intake | 01 January 2002 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 26 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07453 |

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.

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

Reason: From a review of the information provided, the visitors noted that in the faculty annual report 2015/16 a new assessment strategy has been created for second year students in the Objective Structured Clinical Exam (OSCE). As such, the visitors were unable to determine how the assessment strategy and design continues to ensure that the students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for speech and language therapists. The visitors therefore require evidence to determine that the new assessment strategy allows the student to continue to meet the standards of proficiency for their profession.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating that the new assessment strategy ensures students continue to meet the SOP's for their profession.

6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: As the visitors were unable to determine whether the new assessment strategy was effective in measuring the standards of proficiency for their profession, they were unable to determine if the assessment methods are thorough and effective. In order for the visitors to be able to make a judgement on whether this standard continues to be met, the education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that the assessment methods are thorough and effective.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating that the new assessment strategy is thorough and effective.

6.3 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting.

Reason: As the visitors were unable to determine whether the new assessment strategy was effective in measuring the standards of proficiency for speech and language therapists they were unable to determine if the assessment procedures assessed the professional aspects of practice in the education and practice placement setting. In order for the visitors to be able to make a judgement on whether this standard continues to be met, the education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that professional aspects of practice are integral to the assessment procedures in both the education and practice placement setting.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating that the new assessment strategy ensures professional aspects of practice are integral to the assessment procedures in both the education and practice placement setting.

6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: As the visitors were unable to determine whether the new assessment strategy was effective in measuring the standards of proficiency for speech and language therapists they were unable to determine if the assessment methods employed measure the learning outcomes. In order for the visitors to be able to make a judgement on whether this standard continues to be met, the education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that assessment methods measure the learning outcomes of each module.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating that the new assessment method measures the learning outcomes of each module.

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

Reason: As the visitors were unable to determine that the new assessment strategy and design continues to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for speech and language therapists. As such, they were unable to determine how the education provider monitors and measures student performance and the criteria used to assess students at each stage

in their learning. In order for the visitors to be able to make a judgement on whether this standard continues to be met, the education provider must demonstrate how the education provider monitors, measures student performance and the criteria used to assess students at each stage in their learning.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating that the education provider monitors, measures student performance, and the criteria used to assess students at each stage in their learning.

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 24 May 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 | Teesside University |
| Name of programme(s) | BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12522-H8G8M3 |

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:

| | |
|--------------|----------------|
| Glyn Harding | Paramedic |
| Luke Tibbits | Social worker |
| Amal Hussein | 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 August 2003 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 45 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07459 |

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 24 May 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 | Teesside University |
| Name of programme(s) | Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DCounsPsy), Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12419-Z2P0T3 |

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:

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Ian Davies | Biomedical scientist |
| Jai Shree Adhyaru | Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DCounsPsy) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Counselling psychologist |
| First intake | 01 January 2002 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 22 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07461 |

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 24 May 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 | Teesside University |
| Name of programme(s) | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy), Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12523-S4H9R1 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Joanna Goodwin | Occupational therapist |
| Ruth Baker | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Clinical psychologist |
| First intake | 01 January 1996 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07462 |

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 24 May 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 | Teesside University |
| Name of programme(s) | DipHE Operating Department Practice, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12458-C3V5Q0 |

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:

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Tony Scripps | Operating department practitioner |
| Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Programme name | DipHE Operating Department Practice |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Operating department practitioner |
| First intake | 01 September 2002 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07463 |

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 24 May 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 | Teesside University |
| Name of programme(s) | Postgraduate Diploma Social Work, Full time MA Social Work (Pre-Qualifying), Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12526-Q4Z6F8 |

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:

| | |
|--------------|----------------|
| Glyn Harding | Paramedic |
| Luke Tibbits | Social worker |
| Amal Hussein | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Programme name | Postgraduate Diploma Social Work |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 45 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07464 |

| | |
|----------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name | MA Social Work (Pre-Qualifying) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 45 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07477 |

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 24 May 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 | Teesside University |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12524-G5D1F3 |

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:

| | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Anthony Power | Physiotherapist |
| Kathryn Campbell | Physiotherapist |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 September 1998 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 46 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07466 |

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 24 May 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 | Teesside University |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration), Full time Pg Dip Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration), Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12422-Q1K7C5 |

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:

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Linda Mutema | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Shaista Ahmad | 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 September 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 16 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07468 |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Programme name | Pg Dip Diagnostic Radiography (Pre-registration) |
|----------------|--|

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Radiographer |
| Modality | Diagnostic radiographer |
| First intake | 01 September 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 16 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07470 |

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.

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

Reason: From a review of the course leader report, the visitors noted several staff changes including a new part-time senior lecturer in medical imaging as well as, a new module leader for the preliminary clinical evaluation module. The visitor was provided with the CV for the part-time senior lecturer and was satisfied that she was appropriate for the role. However, the visitor did not see any evidence for the module leader for the preliminary clinical evaluation module. As such, the visitor was unable to determine whether this staff member had the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to teach the preliminary clinical evaluation module. The visitor therefore requires evidence to demonstrate that the new module leader has the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge for the role.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence to demonstrate that the new individual appointed has the relevant qualifications and experience to teach the clinical evaluation module.

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitor noted that this programme is using the same practice-based learning settings as the BSc Diagnostic Radiography programme. As the BSc Diagnostic Radiography programme has increased their numbers to 50 learners per cohort and the practice based learning environments are shared between the BSc and MSc pathway for this programme, the visitor was unable to determine how all learners gain access to the available range of learning experiences in a variety of practice environments. The visitor therefore requires evidence to demonstrate that the increased number of learners allows access to a range of practice placements, which are appropriate to the support, and delivery of the programme and achievement of the learning outcomes.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence that there continues to be an appropriate number, duration and range of practice based learning to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes given the increase in numbers.

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 24 May 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 | Teesside University |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12525-R4L6H8 |

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:

| | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Anthony Power | Physiotherapist |
| Kathryn Campbell | Physiotherapist |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Programme name | MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2005 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07469 |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Programme name | Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| First intake | 01 September 2005 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07471 |

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 24 May 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 | Teesside University |
| Name of programme(s) | Advancing from Supplementary to Independent Prescribing, Part time Advancing Non Medical Prescribing (postgraduate), Part time Non Medical Prescribing (undergraduate), Part time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12423-G2X6B1 |

Contents

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

| | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Alaster Rutherford | Independent prescriber |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Advancing from Supplementary to Independent Prescribing |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing |
| First intake | 01 September 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07472 |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Programme name | Advancing Non Medical Prescribing (postgraduate) |
|----------------|--|

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 130 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07475 |

| 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 |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Non Medical Prescribing (undergraduate) |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Entitlement | Independent prescribing Supplementary Prescribing |
| First intake | 01 January 2014 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 2 |
| Assessment reference | AM07476 |

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. For this assessment the documentation provided was for the individual programmes and the Advancing from Supplementary to Independent Prescribing had only run for one year of this assessment therefore there are tables under each programme to illustrate the documentation received.

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.

For the Advancing from Supplementary to Independent Prescribing programme

| 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 | The module has not run for HCPC professions as there has been no interest in the programme. We did receive the HCPC profession specific internal quality report for 2015 – 2016 when two learners took the programme. |
| External examiner reports from the last two years | No | The module has not run for HCPC professions as there has been no interest in the programme. We did receive the HCPC profession specific internal quality report for 2015 – 2016 when two learners took the programme. |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | No | The module has not run for HCPC professions as there has been no interest in the programme. We did receive the HCPC profession specific internal quality report for 2015 – 2016 when two learners took the programme. |

For the Advancing Non Medical Prescribing (postgraduate) and Non Medical Prescribing (undergraduate) programmes

| 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 24 May 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 | Teesside University |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12461-K8F0P9 |

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:

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Joanna Goodwin | Occupational therapist |
| Ruth Baker | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Mandy Hargood | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2005 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07473 |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | Pg Dip Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2005 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07474 |

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 24 May 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) | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 March 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12426-N1Q7J2 |

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:

| | |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| Karen Harrison | Physiotherapist |
| Pradeep Agrawal | Biomedical scientist |
| Amal Hussein | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 October 1980 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 59 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07486 |

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 | No The education provider submitted course committee minutes as part of the audit. |
| 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.

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

Reason: From the submission provided the visitors noted that the education provider has not submitted an internal quality report from the last two years. The visitors were provided with course committee minutes, however, the course committee minutes were unconfirmed and not signed off to indicate that they are quality reports. In addition, the visitors noted that the responses to the external examiner reports were not signed or

dated. As such, the visitors were not provided with any evidence that clearly demonstrates that the programme continues to have monitoring and evaluation systems in place. Therefore the visitors require evidence to demonstrate that the programme is regularly monitored and evaluated.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate that the programme has monitoring and evaluation system in place. In particular, internal quality report from the last two years and a completed responses to the external examiner reports.

Section 5: 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 24 May 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) | BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12436-V3F8N4 |

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:

| | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| David Abraham | Approved mental health professional |
| Lucy Myers | Speech and language therapist |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Speech and language therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2001 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 27 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07488 |

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 25 May 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)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

From the information provided in the response to the external examiner report 2016/2017 the visitors noted that the education provider is currently planning a campus move in the future and have reviewed their placements programme. As such, the education provider should be aware of the implications this could have upon the programme in the future. The visitors would like to see that this aspect is addressed in future submissions to ensure the standards continues to be met.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Education provider | Royal Holloway, University of London |
| Name of programme(s) | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy), Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12454-Z3K9N2 |

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:

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Linda Mutema | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Ruth Baker | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Practitioner psychologist |
| Modality | Clinical psychologist |
| First intake | 01 January 1997 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 28 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07493 |

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 24 May 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 | Royal Holloway, University of London |
| Name of programme(s) | MSc in Social Work, Full time PG Dip in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 19 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12429-J9T8K2 |

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:

| | |
|--------------|----------------|
| Glyn Harding | Paramedic |
| Luke Tibbits | Social worker |
| Amal Hussein | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | MSc in Social Work |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| First intake | 01 July 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 67 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07494 |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Programme name | PG Dip in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Social worker in England |
| First intake | 01 July 2004 |

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 42 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07495 |

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 24 May 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 South Wales |
| Name of programme(s) | MA Art Psychotherapy, Part time |
| Date of initial assessment | 16 January 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12531-T6V2N8 |

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 |

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 |
| Julie Allan | Arts therapist - Art therapist |
| Niall Gooch | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| Programme name | MA Art Psychotherapy |
| Mode of study | PT (Part time) |
| Profession | Arts therapist |
| Modality | Art therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2013 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 16 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07496 |

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: The visitors reviewed internal quality documents. In the document “Monitoring course report 2015” there was a reference to a significant increase in cohort sizes, from 16 learners in 2015-16 up to 24 learners in 2016-17 (and 32 learners in 2017-18, although the 2017-18 academic year is not within this scope of this audit). The mapping document submitted with the audit also mentioned a “growing course cohort”. The HCPC has not been notified of any increases and it was not clear from the rest of the documentation how many learners had been on the programme during 2015-16 and 2016-17. The programme is currently approved for 16 learners. A change from 16 to 24 learners represents a 50% increase in numbers, and the visitors considered that if this

change had gone ahead, it might affect the programme's ability to meet a number of the standards, for example those in SET 3 relating to resourcing and staffing levels, and those in SET 5 relating to practice-based learning capacity. Without further evidence relating to this they could not be certain the programme was being effectively managed.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence clarifying the extent of the increase in learner numbers, and evidence demonstrating how the education provider has ensured that the programme is still able to meet the standards following the increase, especially those concerning resources and practice-based learning capacity.

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

Reason: The visitors were able to review the curriculum vitae for the new programme leader, Julliet King. From this evidence, they were not able to be certain that Julliet King was appropriately qualified and experienced for the role. In particular it was not clear what experience she had in programme management, and the visitors could not see the details of her academic experience and background. They also noted that she was recorded as teaching on all modules in the programme. This potentially represented a significant teaching load alongside the other responsibilities of the programme leader role, and the visitors considered that without more information they could not be sure that the programme would be effectively managed.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence demonstrating Julliet King's qualifications and experience for the programme leader role, and further evidence relating to how her teaching and administrative responsibilities are balanced to allow effective programme management.

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

Reason: In the mapping document submitted by the education provider it stated that new staff had been recruited to cover an increase in learner numbers, and the visitors were able to see elsewhere in the documentation that three extra staff had been recruited. The education provider has submitted curriculum vitae for these staff. However, the visitors noted that between all of these staff members were part time, so the programme had only gained 1.3 full time equivalents (FTEs). As it was not clear how many learners were on the programme, they could not make a judgment as to whether there were an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence showing that an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff are in place on the programme.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed staff curriculum vitae (CVs). It was not clear which specific areas on the programme were being covered by which staff, and the staff CVs were not always clear on where individual staff members' experience and expertise lay.

From the evidence submitted it appeared that almost all staff had teaching responsibilities across all modules. The visitors also noted that the programme made use of visiting lecturers, but were unable to see information relating to the details of these lecturers' responsibilities, experience and qualification. They were therefore unclear whether subject areas were being taught with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence showing that subject areas are being taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the external examiners' reports for the programme. They were not clear how the education provider was able to make effective use of input from the external examiner. The visitors considered that the lack of detail in the reports, perhaps due to limitations of format, might result in the education provider not receiving an appropriate level of detailed evaluation of the programme. As a result, it was not clear to the visitors that this form of evaluation was effective, nor that comments from external examiners were being used appropriately to develop and improve the programme, and so they were not able to be sure that the standard was met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence demonstrating how the education provider ensures that feedback from external examiners is useful and relevant, and how such feedback is incorporated into 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 24 May 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 Wolverhampton |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, Full time |
| Date of initial assessment | 18 April 2018 |
| Case reference | CAS-12544-L0B0H1 |

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:

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Ian Davies | Biomedical scientist |
| Jai Shree Adhyaru | Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Biomedical scientist |
| First intake | 01 September 2010 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | AM07519 |

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 24 May 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](#).