

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme title	MA Dramatherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Dramatherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist) Dianne Gammage (Dramatherapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	27 June 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

2010 was the first year of delivery for this programme so there are no Internal Quality or External Examiner reports for 2009-10.

- Clinical Placement Handbook
- Module Evaluation Survey Form

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

On their reading of the documentation the visitors read in the Clinical Placement Handbook, (page 108, Supporting Documentation) that "Overall, students will have met the BADTh requirements for 100 face to face dramatherapy clinical hours by the end of the training, and will meet with HPC requirements to have an in-depth experience in at least two settings." HPC standards do not ask for this requirement and therefore the statement should be removed to ensure that students and practice placement educators have the correct information before practice begins.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme title	MA Music Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Music therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Gail Brand (Music therapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	29 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Paper on annual monitoring process change
 - Rules, regulations and procedures for students
 - Programme clinical placements handbook
 - Module evaluation survey form

Section three: Additional documentation

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

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From their review of the documentation provided, the visitors could see that the standards of conduct performance and ethics (SCPE) are taught through the clinical placement, the Experiential Development 1 module and the virtual learning environment. However, the documentation for the clinical placement, the module descriptor and the virtual learning environment were not provided. Therefore from their reading of the information provided, the visitors could not see evidence of how the SCPE are embedded in the curriculum to ensure that students understand the implications of the standards.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that clearly identifies where the SCPE are embedded within the curriculum to ensure that students understand the implications of these standards.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	4
Section five: Visitors' comments	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)
Programme title	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time accelerated
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Lucy Myers (Speech and language therapist)
HPC executive	Victoria Adenugba
Date of assessment day	29 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - The programme did not respond to the external examiners report for the last two years as no response was required
 - Procedures for the resolution of students' concerns / issues
 - Curriculum document

- Quality and standards document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

The visitors reviewed the documentation provided as part of this annual monitoring submission. Due to the collaboration with Bangor University coming to an end there have been changes to the way this programme is run. As such the visitors are unable to determine how this standard has been affected. The visitors would like further information on how this will effect staffing and teaching. They therefore require further clarification on the changes and how they will affect the number of staff in place to deliver this programme.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the number of staff delivering the programme as the collaboration with Bangor University has ceased.

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

The visitors reviewed the documentation provided as part of this annual monitoring submission. Due to the collaboration with Bangor University coming to an end there have been changes to the way this programme is allocated resources as they will no longer be shared by the institutions. As such the visitors are unable to determine how this standard has been affected. The visitors would like further information on how this will affect the number of learning resources available to students. They therefore require further clarification on the changes and how they will affect the learning resources available to students on this programme.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the learning resources which will be available to students as the collaboration with Bangor University has ceased.

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.

The visitors reviewed the documentation provided as part of this annual monitoring submission in which the education provider highlighted that there had been changes to the programme curriculum. However they were unable to

distinguish how these proposed changes have affected the curriculum. As a result the visitors are unable to establish the impact these changes may have on how the programme ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. They therefore require further clarification on these changes.

Suggested documentation: Information mapping the proposed curriculum changes to the curriculum and standards of proficiency.

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.

The visitors reviewed the documentation provided as part of this annual monitoring submission in which the education provider highlighted that there had been changes to the programme curriculum. However they were unable to distinguish how these changes have affected the curriculum. As a result the visitors are unable to establish the impact these changes may have on how the programme ensures that the Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum. They therefore require further clarification on these changes.

Suggested documentation: Information mapping the proposed curriculum changes to the curriculum and standards of proficiency.

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.

The visitors reviewed the documentation provided as part of this annual monitoring submission in which the education provider highlighted that there had been changes to the programme curriculum. However they were unable to distinguish how these changes have affected the curriculum. As a result the visitors are unable to establish the impact these changes may have on how the programme ensures that the assessment strategy and design ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. They therefore require further clarification on these changes.

Suggested documentation: Information mapping the curriculum changes to the previous curriculum and standards of proficiency.

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

The visitors reviewed the documentation provided as part of this annual monitoring submission in which the education provider highlighted that there had been changes to the programme curriculum. However they were unable to distinguish how these changes have affected the curriculum. As a result the visitors are unable to establish the impact these changes may have on how the programme ensures that assessment methods are employed to measure the learning outcomes. They therefore require further clarification on these changes.

Suggested documentation: Information mapping the curriculum changes to the previous curriculum and standards of proficiency.

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

The visitors reviewed the documentation provided as part of this annual monitoring submission in which the education provider highlighted that there had been changes to the programme curriculum. However they were unable to distinguish how these changes have affected the curriculum. As a result the visitors are unable to establish the impact these changes may have on how the programme ensures that the measurement of student performance is objective and ensure fitness to practise. They therefore require further clarification on these changes.

Suggested documentation: Information mapping the curriculum changes to the previous curriculum and standards of proficiency.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the resources effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. However, the visitors recommend that the programme team highlight what is required reading within the module reading lists and which may be recommended. In this way the programme team may be able to better articulate for students which texts are key and which will enhance students' understanding of the subjects.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Imaging
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Sharon Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer) Maureen Henderson (Dietitian)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	29 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - CV's
 - Student complaints procedure
 - Updated Practice education Handbook
 - Code of student conduct and Fitness to Practice

Section three: Additional documentation

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

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From a review of the SETs mapping document the visitors noted the education provider stated that the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are "embedded in all profession specific practice and academic modules". From a review of the annual monitoring submission and the references within the SETs mapping document the visitors noted several references to the education provider's codes of professional conduct but were unable to determine where the curriculum refers specifically to the HPC's standards. The visitors therefore require further information that outlines where the HPC standards are taught and covered within the curriculum to ensure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Further information that outlines where the HPC standards are taught and covered within the curriculum to ensure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the Register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Fiona McCullough (Dietitian) Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	31 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Certificate of BDA accreditation June 2011
 - Confidentiality and disclosure of information
 - Definitive Programme Document Final Sections 1-9 for HPC
 - Evidence for specific aims
 - Programme handbook
 - Student staff Consultative group November 2010

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Reason: The visitors noted the reference included in the completed SETs mapping document for this programme directed the visitors to the Programme Re-approval Submission Document May 2010 for evidence of meeting this standard. The page referenced indicated "The programme is intending to adopt the Fitness to Practice Policy and Procedures implemented by the University for Session 2010-2011" (p16). However, the visitors noted that the associated fitness to practice policy and procedures were not included as part of this annual monitoring submission. To ensure this standard is met the visitors require further evidence of the fitness to practice policy and procedures which are in place.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate the programme has a fitness to practise policy in place.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Gail Brand (Music therapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	29 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Quality Assurance and Enhancement Handbook (Chapters 4 and 7)
 - Fitness to Practice Document
 - Definitive Programme Document (March 2009) Programme Board minutes

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: From their reading of the documentation the visitors could not find evidence to show that a formal student complaints process is in place for this programme. The visitors were aware, from an alternative submission from a different programme that the education provider has an institution wide complaints process in place. However, the visitors require further information about the student complaints process and how it applies to this programme.

Documentation: Evidence to indicate that the education provider wide complaints document applies to this programme and how it is implemented.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiography
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Jane Day (Therapeutic radiographer) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	31 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Louise Boyle CV
 - Code of student discipline
 - Code of Professional Conduct and Fitness to Practise: Policy and Procedures for Staff and Student Guidance

Section three: Additional documentation

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

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The visitors noted that although reference was made to the 'Radiotherapy and Oncology Programme Approval Document' in the SETs mapping document to evidence that this standard is being met this document was not present in the submission. The visitors were not presented with any other evidence to show how the programme makes sure students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how this standard is being met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that the programme makes sure students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glyndwr University
Programme title	Professional Certificate (Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for AHPs at level 6)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Catherine O'Halloran (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	31 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Student's complaints process
 - Student's profession-related conduct process
 - Draft timetable

Section three: Additional documentation

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

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that the education provider provided a draft timetable as evidence of meeting this standard. The visitors noted that the draft timetable made reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. However from the draft timetable alone the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that students understand the implications of these standards. The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates where the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are included within the curriculum and how it makes sure that students understand the implications of these standards.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence that demonstrates where the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are included within the curriculum and how it makes sure that students understand the implications of these standards.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glyndwr University
Programme title	Professional Certificate (Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for AHPs at level 7)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Catherine O'Halloran (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	31 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Student's complaints process
 - Student's profession-related conduct process
 - Draft timetable

Section three: Additional documentation

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

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that the education provider provided a draft timetable as evidence of meeting this standard. The visitors noted that the draft timetable made reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. However from the draft timetable alone the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that students understand the implications of these standards. The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates where the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are included within the curriculum and how it makes sure that students understand the implications of these standards.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence that demonstrates where the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are included within the curriculum and how it makes sure that students understand the implications of these standards.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Guildhall School of Music and Drama
Name of awarding / validating body	City University
Programme title	MA Music Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Music therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Pauline Etkin (Music therapist) Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	21 June 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Programme revalidation submission

- Student Complaint Procedure and Appeals Procedure (Taught Programmes)
- Programme Fitness to Practise Procedure
- Seminar information and request for HPC publications
- Module D2 Professional Practice lecture list

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that there were instances of the term "state registration" in the programme documentation and in terms of the professional body the name was inappropriately recorded. The visitors would like to highlight that the term "state registration" is no longer used in relation to the HPC and that the documentation should reflect the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation. In this way the information in the programme documentation may better reflect HPC registration and further embed it in students' learning. The visitors would also like to re-emphasise that as the Pg Dip Music Therapy programme does not provide eligibility to apply to the register this should be clear in the programme documentation to ensure that there is no confusion.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Keele University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	William Gilmore (Biomedical scientist) Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	26 June 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Summary of changes since 2009 HPC approval document
 - Programme specification
 - Course regulations
 - Education provider regulations pertaining to complaints procedure and fitness to practise

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-07-12	a	EDU	RPT	AM report Keele - BSc (Hons) ABMS - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the Register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	31 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Students complaints procedure
 - Definitive course document April 2011
 - Policy, regulations and procedures relating to professional suitability or professional misconduct
 - Annual Contract Review notes 2009

- Annual Contract Review notes 2010-11
- MSCOT February 2011 minutes In Year Meetings

Section three: Additional documentation

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

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The visitors noted the reference within the completed SETs mapping document which directed them to the Definitive course document. Within the course document there was the statement that, "The students are introduced to the HPC and COT guidance on the standards of conduct and code of ethics during their first two weeks at the University in the Working and Learning Together Module (this serves as an introduction to master's level (7) and inter-professional learning; and to professional suitability requirements). This is also highlighted during practice placement". The Working and Learning Together Module referred to was not included in the evidence for this submission. From the evidence submitted the visitors could not determine any specific reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics through the programme curriculum. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme curriculum ensures students will understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how students are informed of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and are informed of the implications of those standards, such as information relating to the Working and Learning Together module.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the

programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme title	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the Register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	31 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Students complaints procedure
 - Definitive course document April 2011
 - Policy, regulations and procedures relating to professional suitability or professional misconduct
 - Annual Contract Review notes 2009

- Annual Contract Review notes 2010-11
- MSCOT February 2011 minutes In Year Meetings

Section three: Additional documentation

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

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The visitors noted the reference within the completed SETs mapping document which directed them to the Definitive course document. Within the course document there was the statement that, "The students are introduced to the HPC and COT guidance on the standards of conduct and code of ethics during their first two weeks at the University in the Working and Learning Together Module (this serves as an introduction to master's level (7) and inter-professional learning; and to professional suitability requirements). This is also highlighted during practice placement". The Working and Learning Together Module referred to was not included in the evidence for this submission. From the evidence submitted the visitors could not determine any specific reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics through the programmes curriculum. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme curriculum ensures students will understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how students are informed of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and are informed of the implications of those standards, such as information relating to the Working and Learning Together module.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the

programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	London Ambulance Service NHS Trust
Name of awarding / validating body	Institute of Health Care Development
Programme title	IHCD Paramedic Award
Mode of delivery	Block release
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Gordon Pollard (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date postal review	19 June 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

- IHCD (Edexcel) External Verification Reports
- London Ambulance Service Complaints and Feedback Policy
- Student Programme and Module J Handbook
- Disciplinary Policy
- Policy on the Registration of Professional Clinical Staff
- Performance Capability Policy
- London Ambulance Service Vision and Values
- Law and Ethics Handbook and Powerpoint Handouts

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: From the documentation reviewed by the visitors a complaints policy used by the education provider was included. However, the visitors highlighted that it is a policy which is generic and focuses on service users complaining about the service they receive. While the student handbook draws reference to this policy the visitors could not find any explanation in either document about how a student could use this policy if they wish to raise a concern about the education programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to clarify how the complaints policy is appropriate for the programme, and how it is disseminated to students so that they know how the policy works in relation to the programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Medway School of Pharmacy
Name of awarding / validating body	Universities of Greenwich and Kent
Programme title	Postgraduate Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Distance learning
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Catherine O'Halloran (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	31 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Definitive programme document

- Medway School of Pharmacy Application form
- Medway School of Pharmacy prescribing team due diligence application checklist
- Registration requirements letter
- Excerpt from Business plan for School of Pharmacy
- Details and permission form
- Student workbook and guide to the placement
- DMPs guide
- Placement QA review form
- Assessment mapping
- Assessment handbook level M
- Staff CV's
- Summary of teaching team

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Reason: The SETs mapping document directed the visitors to a fitness to practice process on p21 of the Definitive programme document as evidence of meeting this standard. The visitors noted that the reference consisted of a short paragraph and from this evidence were unable to make a judgement on whether they have a process in place for managing concerns about a students' profession-related conduct. The visitors also noted within the SETs mapping document the reference to the University of Greenwich fitness to practice arrangements but this did not form part of the annual monitoring submission. The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates there is a process in place for managing concerns raised about students' profession-related conduct.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence that demonstrates there is a process in place for managing any concerns raised about students' profession-related conduct. For example the education provider could submit a fitness to practise procedure applicable to students on this programme.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring Visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Northern Ireland Ambulance Service Health and Social Care Trust
Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)	Institute of Health Care Development
Programme title	Paramedic-in-training
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date postal review	8 June 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Performance Meeting Progress
 - Training Plan Summary

- Student / Staff Liaison Group Minutes
- Practice Quality Documents
- Practice Placement Audit Tool
- End of Course Report
- Corporate Induction Day Pro-Forma
- Paramedic In-Training Programme Student Handbook
- Staff Information Booklet
- Paramedic In Training Unit 1 Module 'D'
- Student Assignment Schedule
- Legal and Ethical Assessment
- Conduct and Ethics for Students

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Reason: The visitors could not determine from the documentation received, how the student profession-related conduct process worked. Therefore the visitors require documentation that demonstrates how this process operates. Currently it would be difficult for the student to separate out issues of professional conduct and employment issues which appear to be being dealt with by the same process.

Suggested Documentation: Documentation to evidence how the policy deals with professional issues, and how they are managed within the educational environment, rather than employment issues.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Nicola Spalding (Occupational therapist) David Packwood (Practitioner psychologist)
HPC executive	David Christopher
Date of assessment day	31 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Programme specification
 - Validation and Approval Panel Report
 - Module descriptor Foundations of Learning and Collaborative Working

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: From a review of the SETs mapping document, the visitors noted a reference to the education provider's formal student complaints process. A web link to the complaints process was provided, together with references to the Student Handbook and a whistle blowing policy in the Placements Handbook. However, none of these documents were provided in the annual monitoring submission and so the visitors were unable to determine whether this standard is met. The visitors therefore require documentation relating to the student complaints process to be assured that the standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Documentation setting out the student complaints process.

3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Reason: From a review of the SETs mapping document, the visitors noted a reference to the education provider's processes for addressing concerns about student professional suitability. References were made to the Pre-registration Health Handbook for students and the Clinical Practice Assessment document. A web link to the Pre-registration Health Handbook was provided. However, none of these documents were provided in the annual monitoring submission and so the visitors were unable to determine whether this standard is met. The visitors therefore require documentation relating to the processes in place to deal with concerns about students' profession-related conduct to be assured that the standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Documentation setting out the process for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reasons: From a review of the SETs mapping document, the visitors noted that evidence provided to demonstrate that SET was met was included in the module descriptor for Foundations of Learning and Collaborative Working, the Clinical Practice Assessment document and the Student Programme Handbook. Visitors noted that this evidence included references to ethics, but there was no specific reference to the HPC or the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The

other documents referred to had not been provided as part of this annual monitoring submission. The visitors were therefore unable to determine where this standard is addressed. To be assured that this standard is met, the visitors require documentation which demonstrates where the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered in the curriculum.

Suggested documentation: Documentation which demonstrates where the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered in the curriculum.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Nicola Spalding (Occupational therapist) David Packwood (Practitioner psychologist)
HPC executive	David Christopher
Date of assessment day	31 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Programme specification
 - Validation and Approval Panel Report
 - Module descriptor Foundations of Learning and Collaborative Working

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: From a review of the SETs mapping document, the visitors noted a reference to the education provider's formal student complaints process. A web link to the complaints process was provided, together with references to the Student Handbook and a whistle blowing policy in the Placements Handbook. However, none of these documents were provided in this annual monitoring submission and so the visitors were unable to determine whether this standard is met. The visitors therefore require further evidence relating to the student complaints process to be assured that this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Documentation setting out the student complaints process.

3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Reason: From a review of the SETs mapping document, the visitors noted a reference to the education provider's processes for addressing concerns about student professional suitability. References were also made to the Pre-registration Health Handbook for students and the Clinical Practice Assessment document. A web link to the Pre-registration Health Handbook was provided. However, none of these documents were provided as part of this annual monitoring submission and so the visitors were unable to determine whether this standard is met. The visitors therefore require further evidence relating to the processes in place to deal with concerns about students' profession-related conduct to be assured that the standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Documentation setting out the process for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reasons: From a review of the SETs mapping document, the visitors noted that evidence showing how this SET was met was included in the module descriptor for Foundations of Learning and Collaborative Working, the Clinical Practice Assessment document and the Student Programme Handbook. The visitors were unclear how the reference to the level 4 module provided additional evidence to meet this SET. They noted that this module was not included in the programme

specification, although it was included in the programme specification for the separate BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme. However, visitors noted that although the module descriptor included references to ethics, there was no specific reference to the HPC or the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The other documents referred to had not been provided as part of this annual monitoring submission. The visitors were therefore unable to determine where this standard is addressed. To be assured that this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate where the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered in the curriculum.

Suggested documentation: Documentation which demonstrates where the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered in the curriculum.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the Register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Angela Ariu (Occupational therapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	31 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

The education provider did not submit the internal quality report, the external examiner's report and the response to the external examiner's report for two years ago. They stated that this programme was revalidated in April 2010 with the introduction of a new teaching programme in January 2011. Therefore the abovementioned documentation was considered not to be relevant to the programme now.

- Occupational Therapy Philosophy Theory and Practice module descriptor
- Introduction to Professional Practice module descriptor
- Practice Experience One, Two and Three module descriptors
- Student Fitness to Practice Regulations
- Student Complaints Procedure

Section three: Additional documentation

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

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The visitors noted for this standard the completed SETs mapping document references several modules and states that 'Students [are] issued with COT code of ethics and professional conduct which reiterates the HPC requirements'. From the evidence submitted the visitors could not determine any specific references to HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme curriculum ensures students will understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how students are informed of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and are informed of the implications of those standards.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme title	Pg Dip Radiotherapy and Oncology in Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiography
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Jane Day (Therapeutic radiographer) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	31 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Record of updates to current course documents through minor modifications
 - Module descriptors

- Student Complaints Policy
- Student Fitness to Practise Regulations

Section three: Additional documentation

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

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From information provided in the SETs mapping document, the visitors noted that two module descriptors were given as evidence that this standard is met. However in reviewing this documentation, the visitors were unable to find any reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPE) in these module descriptors. The visitors were therefore unclear as to how these modules ensure that students on this programme are aware of the implications of the SCPE. As such the visitors could not determine how the programme continues to meet this standard.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of how the programme's curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiography
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Jane Day (Therapeutic radiographer) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	31 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Record of updates to current course documents through minor modifications
 - Interview day presentation

- June 2011 minutes entry requirements
- Prospectus Entry Requirements and 4.2 Change Entry Requirements
- Student Complaints Procedure
- Student Fitness to Practise Regulations
- Module descriptors

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted the visitors noted that advertising information on the website did not comply with the HPC's advertising guidance. It is stated that the PG Dip Radiotherapy and Oncology in Practice 'allows you to register with the Health Professions Council.' This information is misleading as SET 2.1 requires education providers to be clear that completing an approved programme means that students completing the programme are 'eligible to apply' for registration with the HPC. The visitors also noted that following a reduction of required English proficiency, there were inconsistencies with the required IELTS level for programme admission in advertising information. The visitors therefore require that the programme team ensures advertising materials are consistent, provide applicants with accurate information, and comply with the HPC advertising guidance.

Suggested documentation: Revised advertising materials for the programme to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

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

Reason: The visitors noted a reduction in the entry requirements for English language proficiency in the SETS mapping document. The visitors were concerned that the level is below the level to meet the standards of proficiency (SOP) 1b.3 – 'to be able to demonstrate effective and appropriate skills in communicating information, advice, instruction and professional opinion to colleagues, service users, their relatives and carers'. As a result of this reduction in the IELTS level required by the programme, the visitors were unclear how this reduction would be mitigated elsewhere in the programme. The visitors could not

identify how the programme continues to ensure that students who complete the programme would be able to meet all of the relevant standards of proficiency. In particular the visitors could not determine how the programme continues to ensure that graduates will have effective and appropriate skills to communicate information, advice, instruction and professional opinion to colleagues, service users, their relatives and carers.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how the programme ensures that students who successfully complete the programme meet this standard and in particular how the programme ensures that these graduates can meet SOP 1b.3.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors would like to suggest that the programme team consider revising its reading lists to include the most up-to-date publications available. In this way the programme team may be able to enhance the way it utilises the learning resources available for students.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Tavistock & Portman NHS Foundation Trust
Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)	University of Essex
Programme title	Doctorate in Child, Community and Educational Psychology (D.Ch.Ed.Psych.)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Educational psychologist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist) George Delafield (Forensic psychologist / occupational psychologist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	26 July 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

- Research Degree Programme Review for Academic Year 2009-10
- Research Degree Programme Review for Academic Year 2010-11
- Tavistock Training Stakeholders' Group Minutes 2009-10
- Tavistock Training Stakeholders' Group Minutes 2011-12

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted from a review of this submission that the education provider plans to make further staffing changes to the programme in the future, in particular in relation to research supervision. The education provider has also said that there are changes to the national funding for this type of training programme. The visitors would like remind the education provider that they should continue to inform the HCPC of any changes they make to the programme using the major change and annual monitoring processes.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-05-04	a	EDU	RPT	AM report	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Gail Brand (Music therapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	29 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Education provider Student's Complaints Process
 - School of Health and Social Care Fitness to Practice Procedure
 - Induction and pre-clinical timetables

Section three: Additional documentation

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

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From the documentation reviewed by the visitors a timetable was included that showed when the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPE) were taught. However from the information provided, the visitors could not see evidence of how the SCPE are embedded in the curriculum to ensure that students understand the implications of the SCPE. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme curriculum ensures the students understand the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Details of where in the programme curriculum students are informed about the standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the implications of these standards.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-07-05	d	EDU	APV	AM Report Teesside MSc PH	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme title	Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Jacqueline Waterfield (Physiotherapist) Gail Brand (Music therapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	29 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Education provider Student's Complaints Process
 - School of Health and Social Care Fitness to Practice Procedure
 - Induction and pre-clinical timetables

Section three: Additional documentation

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

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From the documentation reviewed by the visitors a timetable was included that showed when the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPE) were taught. However from the information provided, the visitors could not see evidence of how the SCPE are embedded in the curriculum to ensure that students understand the implications of the SCPE. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme curriculum ensures the students understand the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Details of where in the programme curriculum students are informed about the standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the implications of these standards.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-07-05	d	EDU	APV	AM Report Teesside PG Dip PH FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme title	University Certificate of Postgraduate Professional Development: Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Catherine O'Halloran (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	31 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Programme Leader CV
 - Indicative resources

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: From a review of the annual monitoring SETs mapping document the visitors noted that the education provider makes reference to a student complaints process and state that it is attached within the annual monitoring submission. From a review of the documentation the visitors were unable to locate the student complaints process. The visitors therefore require a copy of the student complaints process to demonstrate that this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: A copy of the student complaints process.

3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Reason: From a review of the annual monitoring SETs mapping document the visitors noted that the education provider makes reference to a fitness to practice process and state that it is attached within the annual monitoring submission. From a review of the documentation the visitors were unable to locate the fitness to practice process. The visitors therefore require a copy of the fitness to practice process to demonstrate that this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: A copy of the fitness to practice process.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From a review of the annual monitoring documentation the visitors noted that the education provider provided a reading list as evidence of meeting this standard. The visitors noted that the reading list made reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. However from the reading list alone the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that students understand the implications of these standards. The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates where the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are included in the curriculum to ensure that students understand the implications of the standards.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence that demonstrates where the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are included within the curriculum and how students are made aware of their implications.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme title	University Certificate of Professional Development Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Catherine O'Halloran (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	31 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Programme Leader CV
 - Indicative resources

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: From a review of the annual monitoring SETs mapping document the visitors noted that the education provider makes reference to a student complaints process and state that it is attached within the annual monitoring submission. From a review of the documentation the visitors were unable to locate the student complaints process. The visitors therefore require a copy of the student complaints process to demonstrate that this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: A copy of the student complaints process.

3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Reason: From a review of the annual monitoring SETs mapping document the visitors noted that the education provider makes reference to a fitness to practice process and state that it is attached within the annual monitoring submission. From a review of the documentation the visitors were unable to locate the fitness to practice process. The visitors therefore require a copy of the fitness to practice process to demonstrate that this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: A copy of the fitness to practice process.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From a review of the annual monitoring documentation the visitors noted that the education provider provided a reading list as evidence of meeting this standard. The visitors noted that the reading list made reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. However from the reading list alone the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that students understand the implications of these standards. The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates where the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are included in the curriculum to ensure that students understand the implications of the standards.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence that demonstrates where the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are included within the curriculum and how students are made aware of their implications.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	The Central School of Speech & Drama
Programme title	MA Drama and Movement Therapy (Sesame)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Dramatherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Jane Fisher-Norton (Dramatherapist) Di Gammage (Dramatherapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	29 June 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Placement handbook
 - Course specification
 - Student handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the response to the external examiner report for Janek Duboski included in the documentation was dated 6 months prior to the external examiner's report dated 15 June 2010 and does not seem relevant to the report. The visitors were unsure if the response received for the audit was correct.

Suggested documentation: Documentation to demonstrate that a full response was made to the external examiners report for June 2010.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: The visitors noted that the SETs mapping said that the student complaints policy was available in the student handbook. As the visitors did not receive this document, or the policy within it, they were unsure if this standard is met.

Suggested Documentation Evidence to demonstrate that there is a student complaints process in place.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that for this standard in the SETs mapping the education provider states that this requirement is 'in place'. However, the visitors could not find any further evidence to be assured this standard is met. Therefore the visitors require further information to determine how the programme is meeting this standard.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates where in the programme documentation the requirement for at least one external examiner to be HPC registered, unless other arrangements are agreed, is included.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Strathclyde
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Prosthetist / orthotist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Hazel Currie (Prosthetist / orthotist) Fiona McCullough (Dietician)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	21 June 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Curriculum vitae for Elaine Figgins, Acting Director
 - Information Leaflet
 - Student Handbooks 2010-11, 2011-12
 - Entry requirements for the programme

- Staff List and structure of the department
- Programme Homepage
- Student Resource Pack
- Dates of Departmental Committee Meetings
- Staff / Student Liaison Meeting Minutes
- New Placement Approval / Re-approval Form
- Student Contact Form
- Supervisor pack
- Clinical Competencies
- Procedure Based Assessment Prosthetics
- Procedure Based Assessment Orthotics
- Aims of Placement
- Clinical Supervisors' Training Programme- attendance list
- AHP Practice Educator Programme Jan 2012
- Feedback for Clinical Supervisors Training

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-07-06	b	EDU	RPT	AM report Strathclyde-BSc (Hons) P&O - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted in the audit submission response for SET 5.9 'All Placement educators curriculum vitae (CV's) are HPC requested' which is not accurate. The HPC does not require the submission of placement educator CV's instead it requires that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors also noted that the referencing in the SETs mapping document was not always clear. Therefore they recommend that in future if the education provider clearly identifies where evidence to support the statements in the SETs mapping document can be found in the audit submission this would aid the process greatly.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-07-06	b	EDU	RPT	AM report Strathclyde-BSc (Hons) P&O - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Strathclyde
Programme title	MSci Prosthetics and Orthotics
Mode of delivery	Full Time
Relevant part of HPC register	Prosthetist / orthotist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Hazel Currie (Prosthetist / orthotist) Fiona McCullough (Dietician)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	21 June 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Curriculum vitae for acting programme director
 - Information Leaflet and website information
 - Student Handbooks 2010-11, 2011-12
 - Entry requirements for the programme

- Staff List and structure of the department
- Student Resource Pack
- Staff / Student Liaison Meeting Minutes
- New Placement Approval/Re-approval Form
- Student Contact Form
- Supervisor pack
- Clinical Competencies document and details of Aims of Placement
- Procedure Based Assessment Prosthetics
- Procedure Based Assessment Orthotics
- Clinical Supervisors' Training Programme - attendance list
- AHP Practice Educator Programme Jan 2012

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted in the audit submission response for SET 5.9 'All Placement educators curriculum vitae (CV's) are HPC requested' which is not accurate. The HPC does not require the submission of placement educator CV's instead it requires that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors also noted that the referencing in the SETs mapping document was not always clear. Therefore they recommend

that in future if the education provider clearly identifies where evidence to support the statements in the SETs mapping document can be found in the audit submission this would aid the process greatly.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Programme title	Non Medical Prescribing Programme
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Podiatrist) Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	22 June 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Individual Complaint procedure
 - Module descriptor MST 6NH026

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted in the documentation provided that the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics were dealt with implicitly in the programme documentation alongside those of the NMC. However, they felt that a more explicit reference to the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics would further embed them in students' learning and differentiate them from those of the NMC. The visitors also felt that the programme may benefit from including more information about the system in place for dealing with any issues around student conduct. In this way the programme may better ensure that students are aware of what the process is and what the consequences may be if any issues around their conduct occur.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Ulster
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Graham Harris (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	29 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Podiatry Course Handbook 2011-12
 - Podiatry Student Placement Handbook 2011-12
 - Curriculum vitae's for programme leader and placement co-ordinator

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that on the completed SETs mapping document the education provider stated that there had been some changes to the number of staffing hours for the programme. The education provider stated that “The programme team remain the same in number but have reduced by 0.9 WTE since 2009. One staff member reduced to 0.5 (J.Connolly) and the remaining 5 staff have taken a 0.08 reduction”. The visitors were concerned that this reduction in staffing hours may affect how the programme continues to ensure that there are an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team have managed the reduction of staff hours to maintain the quality of the teaching.

Suggested documentation: Further information which demonstrates how the programme team have managed the reduction of staff hours to maintain the effective delivery of the programme.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The visitors noted that on the completed SETs mapping document the education provider referenced the section of the placement handbook which requires a student to sign against standards for their placement once they have been met. However, from this evidence the visitors could not determine how the programme curriculum would inform students about the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the programme curriculum informs students about the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Details of where in the programmes’ curriculum students are informed about the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the implications of these standards.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that the curriculum vitae's included in the documentation did not include information about the individual's HPC registration status. The visitors suggest in future the education provider considers including evidence of the number of staff that are registered with the HPC so the visitors can be assured there is suitable professional input into the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of York
Programme title	Extended Independent Supplementary Prescribing for Non Medical Prescribers (Level 6)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Catherine O'Halloran (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	31 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Student evaluations 2009-10
 - Student evaluations 2010-11
 - Module Handbook, L6, L7

- Knowledge and Competency Framework, L6, L7
- Course Timetable 2011-12

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided, the visitors noted the education provider included a web link as evidence of meeting this standard. The visitors were unable to access the web-link and hard copies were not provided in the documentation submitted. The visitors were therefore unable to determine that a student complaints process is in place. The visitors require non web based evidence that demonstrates a student complaints process.

Suggested documentation: Non web based evidence that demonstrates a student complaints process.

3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided the visitors noted the education provider included a web link as evidence of meeting this standard. The visitors were unable to access the web-link and hard copies were not in the documentation provided. The visitors were therefore unable to determine that a process is in place for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. The visitors require non web based evidence that demonstrates that a process is in place for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Suggested documentation: Non web based evidence that demonstrates that a process is in place for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of York
Programme title	Extended Independent Supplementary Prescribing for Non Medical Prescribers (Level 7)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Catherine O'Halloran (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	31 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Student evaluations 2009-10
 - Student evaluations 2010-11

- Module Handbook, L6, L7
- Knowledge and Competency Framework, L6, L7
- Course Timetable 2011-12

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided, the visitors noted the education provider included a web link as evidence of meeting this standard. The visitors were unable to access the web-link and hard copies were not provided in the documentation submitted. The visitors were therefore unable to determine that a student complaints process is in place. The visitors require non web based evidence that demonstrates a student complaints process.

Suggested documentation: Non web based evidence that demonstrates a student complaints process.

3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided the visitors noted the education provider included a web link as evidence of meeting this standard. The visitors were unable to access the web-link and hard copies were not in the documentation provided. The visitors were therefore unable to determine that a process is in place for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. The visitors require non web based evidence that demonstrates that a process is in place for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Suggested documentation: Non web based evidence that demonstrates that a process is in place for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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