

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	Bangor University
Programme title	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	28 March 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
 - Staff CV's
 - Fitness to practice policy
 - Standards of conduct, performance and ethics
 - Student grievance 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: From a review of the documentation provided the visitors noted that the programme team 'Provide formal lectures to students relating to the HPC standards of conduct performance and ethics' and '...direct students to the HPC website'. The visitors also noted that the HPC publication, standards of conduct, performance and ethics was also included as part of the submission. However, from the information provided the visitors could not determine what content was provided to students throughout the programme. The visitors were subsequently unable to determine from this how the formal teaching, and the provision of publications, ensures that students are aware of the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team ensures that students are aware of the implications of these standards to be sure that this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Further information about the lectures which are delivered around the standards of conduct, performance and ethics and how students are made aware of the implications of these standards.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- the learning outcomes to be achieved;
- the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;
- expectations of professional conduct;
- the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and
- communication and lines of responsibility.

Reason: In reviewing the documentary submission the visitors were made aware of the change to the 'Clinical Assessment document'. The visitors also noted that this document had been changed to rationalise the previous documentation and avoid duplication both for students and practice placement educators. However, while the visitors noted the revised documentation they could not determine how practice placement providers were being prepared by the programme team for

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-24	d	EDU	RPT	AM report Bangor - DipHE ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

practice placement. In particular they could not determine how the programme team are preparing practice placement educators to utilise the new assessment and ensure that successful students are meeting the relevant learning outcomes associated with practice placements. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team are preparing practice placement educators to supervise students and in particular to assess students' experience of practice placements.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence of how the programme team prepare practice placement educators to supervise students and in particular how they are prepared to use the new assessment documentation to assess students' placement experience.

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.
2012-04-24	d	EDU	RPT	AM report Bangor - DipHE ODP - 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	Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Liz Holey (Physiotherapist) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	2 April 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
 - Standard of Proficiency mapping document for new modules
 - Programme specification
 - Module descriptors
 - Assessment details for levels 4, 5 and 6,

- Monitoring and evaluation and regulations relating to assessments
- Complaints and fitness to practise information
- Documentary comparison of 2007 Programme to 2012 Programme

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.
2012-04-13	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - Cardiff - BSc (Hons) 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	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)
Programme title	Postgraduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Jim Pickard (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	28 March 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
 - Business plan
 - Supporting application form, offer decision and accreditation of prior learning form
 - Bristol online survey and feedback from students
 - Student handbook

- Procedures for the resolution of students' concerns/issues
- Practice based meeting form
- Faculty Curriculum vitae's
- Coursework booklet and curriculum document 2012-13
- Designated medical practitioner handbook and database

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.
2012-03-29	c	EDU	RPT	AM report Cardiff Uni - SP - PT	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	City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Radiotherapy and Oncology) incorporating bridging course
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Brown (Therapeutic radiographer) Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist)
HPC executive	Victoria Adenugba
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 and module specifications
 - Clinical site information sheet

- Policy and guidance document on bullying and harassment
- Whistle blowing policy for students and link lecturers
- Cause for concern form
- Document on professionalism
- Foundation module teaching material document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-29	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - City Uni - BSc (Hons) - RA inc. bridging course - PT	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	City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist) Mary MacDonald (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	28 February 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
 - SLT Programme handbook
 - Clinical handbook
 - Clinical educators handbook

- Clinical tutors handbook
- School of health sciences fitness to practise documentation and procedures
- Staff roles
- Periodic review report and response
- Admissions procedure review
- City placement audit 2010-2011 with letter

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.

The visitors noted from the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document that the education provider had directed them to various sections of the Clinical Handbook. The visitors noted on page 4 of the Clinical Handbook students were directed to HPC's 'Standards of conduct and ethics for students' and were provided with a link to HPC's website. The visitors considered this terminology and link to the website to not accurately or specifically reflect the standards and as such students may be unable to locate HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics on HPC's website utilising this information. The visitor's review of the other sections of the handbook indicated in the SETs mapping document highlighted the assessment strategy for aspects of the programme, but did not provide the visitors with information about where in the curriculum the standards of conduct, performance and ethics were taught and met throughout the programme. The visitors therefore require further documentation in order to ensure this SET is met.

Suggested documentation: Documentation which specifically outlines where the standards of conduct, performance and ethics and where they are taught and met within the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-29	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - City - BSc (Hons) SLT - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-03-29	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - City - BSc (Hons) SLT - 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	City University
Programme title	MSc Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist) Mary MacDonald (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	28 February 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
 - SLT Programme handbook
 - Clinical handbook
 - Clinical educators handbook
 - Clinical tutors handbook

- School of health sciences fitness to practise documentation and procedures
- Qualifying standards clinical placement assessment
- Periodic review report and response
- Admissions procedure review 2010
- City placement audit 2010-2011 with letter

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.

The visitors noted from the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document that the education provider had directed them to the Clinical Handbooks and Qualifying Standards Clinical Placement Assessment as evidence of meeting this standard. The visitors noted on page 4 of the Clinical Handbook 2010-11 students were directed to HPC's 'Standards of conduct and ethics for students' and were provided with a link to HPC's website. The visitors considered this terminology and link to the website to not accurately or specifically reflect the standards and as such students may be unable to locate HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics on HPC's website utilising this information. The visitors review of the other appendices indicated in the SETs mapping document highlighted the assessment strategy for aspects of the programme, but did not provide the visitors with information about where in the curriculum the standards of conduct, performance and ethics were taught and met throughout the programme. The visitors therefore require further documentation in order to ensure this SET is met.

Suggested documentation: Documentation which specifically outlines the standards of conduct, performance and ethics and where they are taught and met within the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-30	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - City - MSc SLT - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-03-30	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - City - MSc SLT - 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	City University
Programme title	Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist) Mary MacDonald (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	28 February 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
 - SLT Programme handbook
 - Clinical handbook
 - Clinical educators handbook
 - Clinical tutors handbook

- School of health sciences fitness to practise documentation and procedures
- Qualifying standards clinical placement assessment
- Periodic review report and response
- Admissions procedure review 2010
- City placement audit 2010-2011 with letter

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.

The visitors noted from the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document that the education provider had directed them to the Clinical Handbooks and Qualifying Standards Clinical Placement Assessment as evidence of meeting this standard. The visitors noted on page 4 of the Clinical Handbook 2010-11 students were directed to HPC's 'Standards of conduct and ethics for students' and were provided with a link to HPC's website. The visitors considered this terminology and link to the website to not accurately or specifically reflect the standards and as such students may be unable to locate HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics on HPC's website utilising this information. The visitors review of the other appendices indicated in the SETs mapping document highlighted the assessment strategy for aspects of the programme, but did not provide the visitors with information about where in the curriculum the standards of conduct, performance and ethics were taught and met throughout the programme. The visitors therefore require further documentation in order to ensure this SET is met.

Suggested documentation: Documentation which specifically outlines the standards of conduct, performance and ethics and where they are taught and met within the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-30	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - City - Pg Dip SLT - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-03-30	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - City - Pg Dip SLT - 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	4
Section five: Visitors' comments	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	East Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust
Programme title	IHCD Paramedic Award
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Jonathan Isserow (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	1 March 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

- University of Northampton Audit - 4 July 2011
- IHCD Qualification Report Form - 5 May 2011

- Tutor Development Excel Tracker
- Paramedic Course Handbook
- Grievance Procedure V4.0
- Disciplinary Procedure V3.0

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.

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Reason: From the visitors reading of the documentation provided the visitors identified that the recruitment policy for the programme had changed. However the documentation provided did not have sufficient evidence regarding any changes to the entry criteria regarding reading, writing and spoken English.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the selection and entry criteria, which evidences a good command of reading, writing and spoken English and how this is applied by the programme team.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that there has been a relationship between the education provider and University of Northampton established. This was evidenced through the inclusion in the audit submission of the Field examination board minutes (19 July 2011). However, HPC had not previously been notified of the establishment of the relationship with Northampton University. The visitors were therefore unclear from reading the documentation provided how the programme was effectively managed and how the relationship with the University of Northampton has impacted on the running of the programme. The information provided did not provide sufficient evidence as to how this relationship impacts the effective management of the programme, especially in terms of the academic and practical content of the programme. The visitors could also not determine if the responsibility for the teaching of the programme modules 'Social science' and 'Pre-Hospital Assessment and Disposition' lies with the education provider or the University of Northampton.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-19	c	EDU	RPT	AM report EMAS IHCD PA FT and PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Suggested documentation: Documentation detailing the effective management of the programme and the relationship between the education provider and the University of Northampton.

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

Reason: In reviewing the documentation the visitors were made aware that changes had been made to the modules delivered as part of the programme. However, whilst the audit submission from the education provider was comprehensive in nature, the visitors did not find it conducive in reviewing these changes. Therefore the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to demonstrate how these changes had been implemented and what effect, if any, they had on how the programme continues to meet the standards of proficiency for the paramedic part of the register.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how the changes to the programme modules have been implemented and what effect if, any, they have had on how the programme continues to meet the standards of proficiency for the paramedic part of the register.

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

Reason: In reviewing the documentation the visitors were made aware that changes had been made to the modules delivered as part of the programme. However, whilst the audit submission from the education provider was comprehensive in nature, the visitors did not find it conducive in reviewing these changes. Therefore the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to demonstrate how these changes had been implemented. As such they could not determine what effect, if any, they had on how the programme's assessment strategy ensures that students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the paramedic part of the register.

Suggested documentation: Documentation that demonstrates how the changes to the programme modules have been implemented and what effect if, any, they have had on the programmes' assessment strategy.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-19	c	EDU	RPT	AM report EMAS IHCD PA FT and PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted in the internal appendix for the review of the programme there were student names on the form and listed the possible results for three students. The visitors stated that the HPC does not require documentation of this sort and would like remind the programme team that any document that is in the public domain should be anonymised before being sent to the HPC.

The visitors wished to point out that the comprehensive nature of the submission was not entirely conducive to assessing this audit. In future the education provider should consider the relevance of submitted documentation, as the documentation necessary for an audit submission such as this is usually far less than provided for this audit. The annual monitoring process is a retrospective one focusing on programmes with ongoing approval and as such a submission usually only consists of the required documentation as highlighted above. Any additional information is only needed when the programme has undergone changes which affect how the SETs continue to be met. The visitors would therefore like to highlight to the education provider that the volume of documentation, and subsequently work, is not necessary for any future HPC annual monitoring audit.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-19	c	EDU	RPT	AM report EMAS IHCD PA FT and PT	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	Goldsmiths College University of London
Programme title	MA Art Psychotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Art therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	28 March 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
 - General regulations – Student complaints and student discipline
 - MA Art Psychotherapy student handbook 2010-11
 - Programme specification

- Quality handbook 2011-2012
- Safe and professional practice booklet

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-29	ceb	EDU	RPT	AM report Goldsmiths - MA - ASAT - FT & PT	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	Institute of Arts in Therapy & Education
Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)	London Metropolitan University
Programme title	MA Integrative Arts Psychotherapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Art therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Jonathan Isserow (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	1 March 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 Handbooks including student complaints process
- Guidelines for Clinical Placement, including student conduct process
- Subject Standards Awards Board Reports for 2009-2010 & 2010-2011

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.

3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Reason: During their review of the documentation it was highlighted that the 'MA IAP' document (p41) contained the consent form for students participating as service users in practical settings. However the visitors were unable to find this document or any additional evidence to determine how this standard is met. The visitors therefore require further evidence to determine how the programme meets this standard.

Suggested documentation: Documentation to clearly show how consent is obtained from students when they are participating as service users in practical settings.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-16	e	EDU	RPT	AM report IATE MA ASAT PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-04-16	e	EDU	RPT	AM report IATE MA ASAT PT	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	BSc (Hons) Clinical Language Sciences (Speech and Language Therapy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist) Paul Brown (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive	Victoria Adenugba
Date of assessment day	28 March 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
 - Action plan 2010/2011 document
 - Policy, regulations and procedures relating to professional suitability or professional misconduct document

- Admissions profile document
- Programme specification
- Student complaints procedure
- Information relating to the standards of conduct, performance and ethics including module specifications and 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.

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.
2012-03-29	ceb	EDU	RPT	AM report - Leeds Met - BSc (Hons) - SLT - 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	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Julia Cutforth (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HPC executive	David Christopher
Date of assessment day	28 March 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
 - Annual NHS Contract Review February 2010, December 2009 and February 2011
 - Student complaints procedure
 - Academic principles and regulations: appeals

- Professional suitability/misconduct policy and procedure
- BSc (Hons) Dietetics admissions profile
- Personal and professional development module specifications and timetables
- Practice placement feedback forms

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-29	c	EDU	RPT	AM report Leeds Met - BSc (Hons) - DT - 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	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Julia Cutforth (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HPC executive	David Christopher
Date of assessment day	28 March 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
 - Annual NHS Contract Review February 2010
 - Student complaints procedure
 - Professional suitability/misconduct policy and 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.

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.
2011-05-04 2012-03-28	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	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme title	MA Art Psychotherapy Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Art therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	28 March 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
 - Professional suitability regulations and procedures
 - Programme handbook
 - Programme specification

- Curriculum Vitae for core staff
- Student complaints

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.
2012-03-29	ceb	EDU	RPT	AM report Leeds Met - MA - ASAT - FT & PT	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 Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) Jennifer French (Music therapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 documentation including action plans, course leader reports, minutes from meetings of annual reviews, curriculum planning and review, enhancement and development, and annual contract review.
 - Professional suitability process

- HPC Approval of Major Change 6 April 2011
- Definitive programme document MSc Physiotherapy
- 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.

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.
2012-03-28	c	EDU	RPT	AM report Leeds Met - MSc PH (Pre-reg) - FT	Draft 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	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Jim Pickard (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 Complaints Procedure
 - Policy, regulations and procedures relating to professional suitability or professional misconduct

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 in the audit mapping document that the sessions on HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) are taught specifically and primarily in six areas. From their reading of the additional information provided, the visitors could not locate the evidence of how the SCPEs are embedded in the curriculum to ensure that students understand the implications of the SCPEs.

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-16	d	EDU	RPT	AM report Leeds Met - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-04-16	d	EDU	RPT	AM report Leeds Met - SP - PT	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	Pg Dip Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Julia Cutforth (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HPC executive	David Christopher
Date of assessment day	28 March 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
 - Annual NHS Contract Review February 2010, December 2009 and February 2011
 - Student complaints procedure
 - Academic principles and regulations: appeals

- Professional suitability/misconduct policy and procedures
- Personal and professional development module specifications and timetables
- Practice placement feedback forms
- Guidance to students on writing a personal statement

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards 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.
2012-03-29	c	EDU	RPT	AM report Leeds Met - Pg Dip - DT - 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	London South Bank University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
HPC executive	David Christopher
Date of assessment day	1 March 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 response to the External Examiner's report for two years ago was not available however the actions taken to address that report were collated into the internal quality report for one and two years ago.

- Curriculum vitae for Alison Jones, the new programme leader
- Student complaint procedure

- Directional statement on professional codes of conduct and student professional conduct board

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: Through a review of the documentation provided the visitors noted the statement in the 'Programme monitoring report 2010/11' that increasing numbers of clinicians were becoming involved in teaching to address staff losses. However, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence as to whether these changes had affected how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training. The education provider therefore needs to provide evidence that despite the indicated staff losses an appropriate number of staff is in place to deliver the programme effectively.

Suggested documentation: The education provider's strategy for ensuring appropriate numbers of staff are in place to deliver an effective programme.

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 reference to the 'Facilitating Learning in professional practice unit specification' as evidence of compliance with this standard. The visitors noted that the specification included reference to requirements of professionalism and its application with a range of patients and professionals. However, there was no specific evidence of how the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were addressed or a reference to these in the unit reading list. To be assured that this standard is met the visitors require a clear outline of how the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum.

Suggested documentation: A clear indication of how students are made aware of the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-16	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - LSBU - BSc (Hons) PH - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-04-16	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - LSBU - BSc (Hons) PH - PT	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	London South Bank University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
HPC executive	David Christopher
Date of assessment day	1 March 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 response to the External Examiner's report for two years ago was not available however the actions taken to address that report were collated into the internal quality report for one and two years ago.

- Curriculum vitae for Alison Jones, the new programme leader
- Student complaint procedure

- Directional statement on professional codes of conduct and student professional conduct board

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: Through a review of the documentation provided the visitors noted the statement in the 'Programme monitoring report 2010/11' that increasing numbers of clinicians were becoming involved in teaching to address staff losses. However, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence as to whether these changes had affected how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training. The education provider therefore needs to provide evidence that despite the indicated staff losses an appropriate number of staff is in place to deliver the programme effectively.

Suggested documentation: The education provider's strategy for ensuring appropriate numbers of staff are in place to deliver an effective programme.

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 reference to the 'Facilitating Learning in professional practice unit specification' as evidence of compliance with this standard. The visitors noted that the specification included reference to requirements of professionalism and its application with a range of patients and professionals. However, there was no specific evidence of how the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were addressed or a reference to these in the unit reading list. To be assured that this standard is met the visitors require a clear outline of how the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum.

Suggested documentation: A clear indication of how students are made aware of the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-16	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - LSBU - BSc (Hons) PH - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-04-16	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - LSBU - BSc (Hons) PH - PT	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	London South Bank University
Programme title	Postgraduate Certificate in Non-medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Victoria Adenugba
Date of assessment day	1 March 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
 - NMP timetable – professional issues
 - Module Evaluation Questionnaire
 - Students Code of Practice Academic Misconduct
 - Faculty Business Plan 2010-2011

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 audit submission the visitors were unable to find the evidence that was referred to within the SETs mapping document regarding the complaints process “LSBU student handbook”. To ensure that the programme has a formal student complaints process in place the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of 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 SETs mapping document the visitors were referred to the “Student Codes of Practice 4 (Scp4) Academic Misconduct” document as evidence of compliance with this standard. The visitors reviewed this document but could only find evidence of how student academic misconducts would be dealt with. They were unable to find sufficient evidence regarding how concerns about students’ profession-related conduct are dealt with. To ensure that the programme is meeting this standard and has a suitable policy in place to deal with concerns about students’ profession-related conduct the visitors require further evidence.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of a 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.

Reason: From a review of the SETs mapping document the visitors were referred to the “NMP timetable – professional issues” as evidence of compliance with this standard. The visitors reviewed the timetable but found there was insufficient evidence presented as to how the programme curriculum made sure that students understood the HPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics. To ensure that the programme is meeting this standard and that students

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-13	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - LSBU - Non-med Pres - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics the visitors require further evidence.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence of the mechanisms in place that ensure that students on the programme 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.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-13	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - LSBU - Non-med Pres - PT	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	Nordoff Robbins
Name of awarding / validating body (if different from education provider)	City University
Programme title	Master of Music Therapy (Nordoff Robbins): Music, Health, Society
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Music therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) Jennifer French (Music therapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	28 March 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

- Document: A submission for the validation of a programme leading to the award of Master of Music Therapy (Nordoff Robbins): Music, Health, Society including information about monitoring and evaluation systems; student complaints process; and awareness of HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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.
2012-03-28	c	EDU	RPT	AM report Nordoff Robbins - MA of MT - 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	4
Section five: Visitors' comments	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practice
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	28 March 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
 - VR1 form – validation and approval panel report

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided the visitors noted that the programme team had included references to several pieces of information as to how the education provider meets this standard. However, the visitors noted that some of the evidence referred to by the programme team was not included in the submission. In particular the visitors did not have a copy of the 'Student handbook (section 4)' or a copy of the whistle blowing policy in 'Placements Handbook - Appendix 14'. Therefore the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine if the education provider has a student complaints process in place and how students could access and use this process.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence of the student complaints process in place at the education provider. This could be in documentation such as the student handbook or a copy of the whistle blowing policy.

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 that the programme team had included references to several pieces of information as to how the programme meets this standard. However, the visitors noted that some of the evidence referred to by the programme team was not included in the submission. In particular the visitors did not have a copy of the 'Pre registration handbook for students' or a copy of the 'Clinical Practice Assessment' document. Therefore the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine how the programme deals with concerns about students' profession related conduct and how this standard continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Information about the policies or processes in place to deal with issues about students' profession related conduct such as the 'Pre registration handbook for students' or a copy of the 'Clinical Practice assessment document'.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-26	g	EDU	RPT	AM report Northumbria - DipHE ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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 provided the visitors noted that the programme team have introduced the module 'PL400' which has been designed to introduce and raise awareness of HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. However, in reviewing the 'PL400' module descriptor the visitors could not identify how it ensures that students understand the implications of HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The programme team also highlighted evidence included within the 'Clinical Practice Assessment' document and 'Student Programme Handbook', however these documents were not included in the documents provided for this submission. The visitors therefore did not have sufficient evidence to determine how the programme team ensure that students understand the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence of how the programme team ensures that students understand the implications of HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. This could be included in documents such as the 'Clinical Practice Assessment' document and 'Student Programme Handbook'.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-26	g	EDU	RPT	AM report Northumbria - DipHE ODP - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted from the additional documentation provided for this audit that the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics are taught throughout the programme. The visitors considered that whilst it was evident that professional, ethical and conduct issues were taught within programme modules, and students were referred to the HPC website there was no direct mention of the HPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics, or the HPC Guidance on conduct and ethics for students within reading lists in module descriptors. The visitors would like to recommend that the education provider considers that where the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are taught, that reference to the HPC publications are included within the module descriptors, to enhance the understanding of the implication of these standards.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-26	g	EDU	RPT	AM report Northumbria - DipHE ODP - 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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) Jennifer French (Music therapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 document
 - VR1 Form - validation and approval panel report
 - Module descriptor – PL0400 – 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: As part of this annual monitoring submission the education provider stated as evidence for this standard a description of what the complaints procedure entails. There was also a website link to the complaints process document. The visitors were unable to access the website link and so were unable to determine whether there is a process in place. The visitors require further evidence of the process to demonstrate this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: The education provider could provide a copy of the complaints procedure in place.

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

Reason: As part of this annual monitoring submission the education provider stated as evidence for this standard a description of how the processes for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct are "thoroughly investigated and acted upon" (SETs mapping document, SET 3.16). There was also a website link to the professional suitability process document. The visitors were unable to access the website link and so were unable to determine whether there is a process in place. The visitors require further evidence of the process to demonstrate this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: The education provider could provide a copy of the professional suitability process procedure in place.

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

Reason: As part of this annual monitoring submission the education provider stated as evidence for this standard a number of sources. The education provider indicated module PL0400, the practice placement assessments and the student programme handbook as areas of the programme where HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are taught and addressed. The education

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-29	b	EDU	RPT	AM report Northumbria Uni at Newcastle - MSc PH - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

provider has only included the module descriptor PL0400 within this submission. From this module descriptor the visitors could not find specific reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and so were unable to determine whether this standard was met. The visitors therefore require further evidence of where in the programme the education provider ensures students understand the implications of HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: The education provider could submit the evidence referred to within the SETs mapping document and/or further information about module PL0400.

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 wish to inform the education provider that as part of this submission they did not review the prospective changes notified to the HPC in the change notification form (November 2011). This was because the changes are prospective and are due to be incorporated into the education provider revalidation event in May 2012. The visitors want the education provider to note that any changes made as a result of this revalidation event will need to be informed to the HPC through the major change process. Although the HPC has been informed of the planned changes previously in the (November 2011) change notification form, the final programme revisions have not yet been confirmed and so the HPC will need to receive information about these changes.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-29	b	EDU	RPT	AM report Northumbria Uni at Newcastle - MSc 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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) Jennifer French (Music therapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 document
 - VR1 Form - validation and approval panel report
 - Module descriptor – PL0400 – 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: As part of this annual monitoring submission the education provider stated as evidence for this standard a description of what the complaints procedure entails. There was also a website link to the complaints process document. The visitors were unable to access the website link and so were unable to determine whether there is a process in place. The visitors require further evidence of the process to demonstrate this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: The education provider could provide a copy of the complaints procedure in place.

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

Reason: As part of this annual monitoring submission the education provider stated as evidence for this standard a description of how the processes for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct are "thoroughly investigated and acted upon" (SETs mapping document, SET 3.16). There was also a website link to the professional suitability process document. The visitors were unable to access the website link and so were unable to determine whether there is a process in place. The visitors require further evidence of the process to demonstrate this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: The education provider could provide a copy of the professional suitability process procedure in place.

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

Reason: As part of this annual monitoring submission the education provider stated as evidence for this standard a number of sources. The education provider indicated module PL0400, the practice placement assessments and the student programme handbook as areas of the programme where HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are taught and addressed. The education

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-29	c	EDU	RPT	AM report Northumbria Uni at Newcastle - BSc (Hons) PH - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

provider has only included the module descriptor PL0400 within this submission. From this module descriptor the visitors could not find specific reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and so were unable to determine whether this standard was met. The visitors therefore require further evidence of where in the programme the education provider ensures students understand the implications of HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: The education provider could submit the evidence referred to within the SETs mapping document and/or further information about module PL0400.

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 wish to inform the education provider that as part of this submission they did not review the prospective changes notified to the HPC in the change notification form (November 2011). This was because the changes are prospective and are due to be incorporated into the education provider revalidation event in May 2012. The visitors want the education provider to note that any changes made as a result of this revalidation event will need to be informed to the HPC through the major change process. Although the HPC has been informed of the planned changes previously in the (November 2011) change notification form, the final programme revisions have not yet been confirmed and so the HPC will need to receive information about these changes.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-29	c	EDU	RPT	AM report Northumbria Uni at Newcastle - BSc (Hons) 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	Northumbria University at Newcastle
Programme title	Prescribing for Non Medical Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Jim Pickard (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 review summary detailing teaching and learning
 - Student handbook September 2010

- Continuing professional development framework student handbook
- Medical supervisor 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.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the audit mapping document made reference to a University professional suitability panel. This was listed as being referred to in Appendix 3 - Student handbook, page 25 and also in Appendix 2, page 11 in the documentation. However on reviewing these documents the visitors could not find reference to a process for dealing with student profession related conduct. Also in the mapping document a web link was provided but as the visitors did not have access to the internet they were unable to look at the documentation. As such they were unable to determine if there was a process for dealing with students' profession related conduct.

Documentation: Evidence which demonstrates how the education provider deals with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-26	f	EDU	RPT	AM report Northumbria - SP - FT & PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-04-26	f	EDU	RPT	AM report Northumbria - SP - FT & PT	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	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Julia Cutforth (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HPC executive	David Christopher
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 document
 - Student complaints procedure
 - Student code of conduct
 - Fitness to practise policy and procedure

- Module descriptors
- Summary of minor revisions to two inter-professional modules

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.
2012-03-28	a	EDU	RPT	AM report Queen margaret BSC Dietetics FT	Draft 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	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Chiropodist/Podiatrist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Jim Pickard (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	28 March 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
- QMU code of conduct
 - QMU Fitness to practice policy
 - QMU student complaints procedure
 - Module descriptor Professional issues

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.
2012-03-30 2012-03-30 2012-03-29	dde	EDU	RPT	AM report QMU - BSc (Hons) - CH - 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	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	BSc Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Chiropodist/Podiatrist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Jim Pickard (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	28 March 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
- QMU code of conduct
 - QMU Fitness to practice policy
 - QMU student complaints procedure
 - Module descriptor Professional issues

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.
2012-03-29	c	EDU	RPT	AM report QMU - BSc - CH - 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	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist) Paul Brown (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive	Victoria Adenugba
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 document
 - Student handbook
 - Student complaints procedure document
 - Fitness to practice policy

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: Within the SETs mapping document, the visitors were directed to the 'Programme handbook, Preparation for Practice 3d module descriptor p.90'. From their review of this module descriptor and other documentation, the visitors could not locate specific reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and could not determine how or where the programme makes sure students understand the implications of these standards. The visitors therefore require documentation which articulates how HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are taught to make sure this programme continues to meet this standard.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding how students understand the implications of HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-24	e	EDU	RPT	AM report - QMU - BSc (Hons) - SLT - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-04-24	e	EDU	RPT	AM report - QMU - BSc (Hons) - SLT - 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	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiography
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Brown (Therapeutic radiographer) Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist)
HPC executive	Victoria Adenugba
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 Handbook
 - Module Descriptors
 - Clinical Management Handbook (Therapy) page 5, 9-10

- Fitness to practice policy

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: As part of their audit the education provider submitted page 5 from their 'Clinical management handbook (Therapy)' which had a hyperlink to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics document. From a review of this page and other documentation the visitors were unable to establish how this programme makes sure students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. As this standard requires that the curriculum refers specifically to the standards of conduct, performance and ethics, and that students understand these standards, including how and when they apply the visitors require documentation which articulates how this is taught to make sure this programme continues to meet this standard.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding how students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-17	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - QMU - BSc (Hons) TRAD - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-04-17	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - QMU - BSc (Hons) TRAD - 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	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	Extended Independent Prescribing and Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Jim Pickard (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	28 March 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
- QA and QE summary
 - Student complaint procedure
 - Fitness to practise procedure
 - Programme entry requirements

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that although there was an external examiners report and response for one year ago, no internal quality report had been submitted and the education provider had included the statement “There is no internal quality audit report for 2010-2011 as the programme is currently suspended subject to review and is not taking students from podiatry, physiotherapy or radiography.” Whilst the visitors were satisfied with the external examiner report and response, they felt that as this is a currently approved programme it must continue to meet all the SETs. The visitors were concerned that the programme did not appear to have undertaken any form of internal review or acted upon the information received from the external examiner. To ensure that the programme’s monitoring and evaluation systems continue to be appropriate and effective, the visitors require further evidence to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

Documentation: Evidence to demonstrate that the programme has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-24	f	EDU	RPT	AM report QMU - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-04-24	f	EDU	RPT	AM report QMU - SP - PT	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	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	Graduate Diploma Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist) Paul Brown (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive	Victoria Adenugba
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 document
 - Student handbook
 - Student complaints procedure document
 - Fitness to practice policy

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: Within the SETs mapping document, the visitors were directed to the 'Student handbook, Preparation for Practice 3d module descriptor p.65'. From their review of this module descriptor and other documentation, the visitors could not locate specific reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and could not determine how or where the programme makes sure students understand the implications of these standards. The visitors therefore require documentation which articulates how the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are taught to make sure this programme continues to meet this standard.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding how students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-24	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - QMU - Graduate Diploma SLT - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-04-24	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - QMU - Graduate Diploma SLT - 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	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	MSc (pre registration) in Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist) Paul Brown (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive	Victoria Adenugba
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 an Internal quality report, External Examiner's report or Response to External Examiner's report for two years

ago as the programme was visited in December 2009 and has only run for 1 academic year.

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.
2012-03-27	a	EDU	RPT	AM report - QMU - MSc SLT - FT and PT	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	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	MSc Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Julia Cutforth (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HPC executive	David Christopher
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 document including module descriptors
 - Student complaints procedure
 - Fitness to practise policy

- Code of conduct

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.
2012-03-29	ceb	EDU	RPT	AM report QMU - MSc - DT - FT & PT	Draft 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	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	MSc Music Therapy (Nordoff Robbins)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Music therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Jennifer French (Music therapist) Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 Committee minutes 15 March 2011
 - Student Staff Consultative Committee meeting minutes 17 October 2011

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.
2012-03-29	b	EDU	RPT	AM report QMU - MSc MT (Nordoff Robbins) - 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	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	Pg Dip Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Julia Cutforth (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HPC executive	David Christopher
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 document
 - Student complaints procedure
 - Fitness to practise policy
 - Code of conduct

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.
2012-03-29	b	EDU	RPT	AM report QMU - PgDip - DT - FT & PT	Draft 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	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	Pg Dip Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Radiography
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Brown (Therapeutic radiographer) Gillian Stevenson (Speech and language therapist)
HPC executive	Victoria Adenugba
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 Academic Handbook September 2011
 - Management of Work Based Learning Handbook
 - Programme Review document

- Validation document April 2011

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: As part of their audit the education provider submitted 'Management of Work Based Learning Handbook' which had a hyperlink to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics document on page 6. From a review of this page and other documentation the visitors were unable to establish how this programme makes sure students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. As this standard requires that the curriculum refers specifically to the standards of conduct, performance and ethics, and that students understand these standards, including how and when they apply the visitors require documentation which articulates how this is taught to make sure this programme continues to meet this standard.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding how students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-19	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - QMU - Pg Dip RA and Oncology - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-04-19	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - QMU - Pg Dip RA and Oncology - 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	Queen Margaret University
Programme title	Pharmacology for Podiatrists
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Prescription only medicine
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Jim Pickard (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	28 March 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
 - Report from external examiner appointed to moderate Pharmacology for Podiatrists in 2011 and 2010
 - Covering letter explaining the difference between the reports from two external examiners
 - Code of conduct
 - Fitness to practice policy
 - Pharmacology context statement that details learning and teaching

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.
2012-03-29	b	EDU	RPT	AM report QMU POM PT	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	Roehampton University
Programme title	MA Art Psychotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Arts therapist
Modality	Art therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	28 March 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
 - New appointment letter

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.
2012-03-29	c	EDU	RPT	AM report Roehampton - MA - ASAT - FT & PT	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	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme title	Supplementary prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist/podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	28 February 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
 - Module Review Form September 2011
 - Module Application Form 2012-2013
 - Definitive Document
 - September 2010 timetable
 - Student Handbooks 2010-2011
 - DMP Handbooks 2010-2011

- Practice Assessment Document
- Placement Audit - flowchart and managers checklist
- Application form
- Student complaints procedure documents

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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 reference to the 2010 timetable as evidence of compliance with this standard. The visitors noted that the timetable lists a number of sessions relating to professional law and ethics. However, there was no specific evidence of how the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were addressed. To be assured that this standard is met the visitors require a clear outline of how the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum.

Suggested documentation: A clear outline of how the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-13	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - SHU - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-04-13	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - SHU - SP - PT	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	The Robert Gordon University
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Victoria Adenugba
Date of assessment day	1 March 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
 - Mott MacDonald Report
 - Outcome of NMC Monitoring Letter 2011-2012
 - Additional Curricula Vitae
 - Fitness for Practice and Fitness to Practise Policy
 - Excerpt from Module Material

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 submission the visitors were unable to find the evidence that was referred to within the SETs mapping document regarding the student complaints process (“Page 17 Course Document”). The visitors noted that the Course Document was not included in this submission. To ensure that the programme has a suitable formal student complaints process in place the visitors require further evidence to ensure this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of 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: The visitors were referred to “Appendix 9 School Fitness to Practice Policy” as evidence of compliance with this standard. The visitors reviewed the evidence and noted the policy was from the School of Nursing and Midwifery. The policy refers to the programme as getting students “ready and suitable to enter the professional register.” The visitors were aware there may be students on this programme who are already on the HPC Register working towards an annotation who do not appear to be accounted for in this policy document. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the policies in place to support students who are already professionally registered with the HPC.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of a 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.

Reason: The visitors were referred to “Appendix 10” as evidence of compliance with this standard. The visitors reviewed Appendix 10 but found there was insufficient evidence presented as to how the programme curriculum made sure that students understood the HPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors therefore require further information to demonstrate the

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-26	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Robert Gordon - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

programme curriculum ensures the students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Further information to demonstrate students on the programme are being informed about 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.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-26	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Robert Gordon - SP - PT	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	The University of Northampton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Chiropodist/Podiatrist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Jim Pickard (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	28 March 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
- CRB policy
 - Student complaints procedure
 - Professional misconduct procedure & cause for concern/fitness to practice
 - Module specifications - for practice modules
 - Additional education commissioning for quality (ECQ) document

- Copy of NILE (internal web/intranet information) and external web link information on HPC's standards supported on electronic learning platform

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.
2012-03-29	c	EDU	RPT	AM report Northampton - BSc (Hons) - CH - 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	The University of Northampton
Programme title	FDS Sc Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Jim Pickard (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	28 March 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

- Board of studies
- Educational review meeting minutes
- CRB policy
- Student complaints policy
- Module specification

- Professional misconduct policy

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-29	ceb	EDU	RPT	AM report Northampton - FDS - PA - FT & PT	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	University of Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Margaret Hanson (Occupational therapist) George Delafield (Forensic psychologist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	28 February 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 has indicated the internal review documentation (internal quality reports, external examiner's reports and responses to

external examiner's reports) do not exist for the part time route because the route has never recruited any students

- Students complaints procedure
- Fitness to practice procedure
- Student disciplinary procedure
- Notes from Stage 2 Health Professions Periodic Review meeting (26 April 2011)

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation indicated the education provider is currently dealing with some issues raised by the external examiners in their reports for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. The external examiners described issues with the education providers' second marking process, with ensuring the marking criteria are applied consistently and with consistency of the feedback given to students. The visitors note the education provider has responded to the external examiner reports stating they were working on the points raised and hoping the 'Scolar electronic submission software' will deal with the issue around second marking (External examiner response R Matheson 2010/2011). The visitors were concerned with the comments raised and require further evidence to determine whether the education provider is ensuring there are appropriate standards in the assessment of students.

Suggested documentation: An update as to the progress of the implementation of Scolar and a summary of how the system is working to date. The visitors also suggest an update on how the education provider is working towards the remaining comments raised by the external examiner.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-27	b	EDU	RPT	AM report Plymouth - BSc (Hons) OT - FT & PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-03-27	b	EDU	RPT	AM report Plymouth - BSc (Hons) OT - FT & PT	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	University of Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practitioner (Community Emergency Health)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Jonathan Isserow (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	1 March 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
 - Final paramedic programme handbook
 - Mentor meeting final summary minutes
 - Equality and diversity policies

- Student complaints process
- Fitness to practice procedures for students
- Code of conduct and disciplinary procedures 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.

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 copies of the standards of conduct performance and ethics (SCPEs) were provided to students on the programme. The education provider also stated in the SETs mapping that the descriptor module records do not have the current reading lists. The updated reading lists were not provided in the documentation reviewed by the visitors. From their reading of the information provided, the visitors could not see evidence of how the SCPEs are embedded in the curriculum to ensure that students understand the implications of the SCPEs.

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-22	c	EDU	RPT	AM report Plymouth BSc (Hons) FT - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-03-22	c	EDU	RPT	AM report Plymouth BSc (Hons) FT - PT	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	University of Plymouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Chiropodist /Podiatrist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	1 March 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
 - BSc Hons Podiatry Programme Handbook 2011-2012
 - Plymouth University Faculty Fitness to Practice Procedure
 - Plymouth University Faculty Student Complaints Procedure
 - Plymouth University Faculty Disciplinary Procedure

- POD313 Descriptive Module Record
- Plymouth University Update of Records 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: The visitors reviewed the evidence referenced in the completed SETs mapping document for this standard (Descriptive Module Record POD313, Code of Conduct, Fitness for Practice Documentation, Updated Records form and Programme Handbook). The visitors considered the module referenced to be the main source of where the students would be taught about the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The evidence submitted did not reference the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors considered the module referenced did not specifically ensure students would fully understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors therefore require further information to demonstrate the programme curriculum ensures the students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Further information about module POD313 particularly how this module informs students of the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-10	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - Plymouth - BSc (Hons) CH - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted from the documentation submitted one of the external examiners had come to the end of their term. The visitors wish to remind the education provider they will need to continue to meet SET 6.11 when recruiting a new external examiner. If the way this standard is met is changed by the recruitment of the new external examiner the education provider will need to inform the HPC through the major change process.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-10	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - Plymouth - BSc (Hons) CH - 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	University of Plymouth
Programme title	DipHE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Operating department practitioner
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Simon Willoughby-Booth (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 handbook for 2010-2011
 - HEAA module handbook 2011-12
 - Module evaluation form
 - Student complaints and disciplinary procedure

- Fitness to practice 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.

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.
2012-03-29	c	EDU	RPT	AM report Plymouth - DipHE - ODP - 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	University of Plymouth
Programme title	Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Studies (Community Emergency Health)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Jonathan Isserow (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	1 March 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
 - Final paramedic programme handbook
 - Mentor meeting final summary minutes
 - Equality and diversity policies

- Student complaints process
- Fitness to practice procedures for students
- Code of conduct and disciplinary procedures 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.

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 copies of the standards of conduct performance and ethics (SCPEs) were provided to students on the programme. The education provider also stated in the SETs mapping that the descriptor module records do not have the current reading lists. The updated reading lists were not provided in the documentation reviewed by the visitors. From their reading of the information provided, the visitors could not see evidence of how the SCPEs are embedded in the curriculum to ensure that students understand the implications of the SCPEs.

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-22	c	EDU	RPT	AM report Plymouth Dip HE PA FT and PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-03-22	c	EDU	RPT	AM report Plymouth Dip HE PA FT and PT	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	University of Plymouth
Programme title	Graduate Diploma Paramedic Practitioner (Community Emergency Health)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Paramedic
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Jonathan Isserow (Art therapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	1 March 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
 - Final paramedic programme handbook
 - Mentor meeting final summary minutes

- Equality and diversity policies
- Student complaints process
- Fitness to practice procedures for students
- Code of conduct and disciplinary procedures 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.

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 copies of the standards of conduct performance and ethics (SCPEs) were provided to students on the programme. The education provider also stated in the SETs mapping that the descriptor module records do not have the current reading lists. The updated reading lists were not provided in the documentation reviewed by the visitors. From their reading of the information provided, the visitors could not see evidence of how the SCPEs are embedded in the curriculum to ensure that students understand the implications of the SCPEs.

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-22	c	EDU	RPT	AM report Plymouth Grad dip PA FT and PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-03-22	c	EDU	RPT	AM report Plymouth Grad dip PA FT and PT	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	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme title	Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Victoria Adenugba
Date of assessment day	1 March 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
 - Staff Curriculum Vitae's
 - External Examiner Curriculum Vitae's
 - Practice Placement Audit
 - MSc Applied Health Studies Programme Handbook 2010-2011

- MSc Applied Health Studies Programme Handbook 2011- 2012
- BSc Health Studies Programme Handbook 2011-2012
- HEA577D / HEAC327D DMP Information Pack
- HEA577D / HEAC327 Application Form
- HEAC577D / HEAC327C Module Handbook
- HEA577D / HEAC327D Definitive Module Record
- CPD Prospectus 2011-2012
- Equality and Diversity Policy
- Enrolment Form
- Postgraduate Application 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.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: From a review of the audit submission the visitors were unable to find the evidence that was referred to within the SETs mapping document “Programme Student Handbook” regarding the student complaints process. To ensure that the programme has a formal student complaints process in place the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that this standards is met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of 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 submission the visitors were unable to find the evidence that was referred to within the SETs mapping document regarding the policy in place to deal with concerns about students’ profession-related conduct (“BSc (Hons) Health Studies Programme Handbook”). To ensure that the programme is meeting this standard and has a suitable policy in place to deal with concerns about students’ profession-related conduct the visitors require further evidence.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-26	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - Plymouth - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Suggested documentation: Evidence of a 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.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence referenced in the completed SETs mapping document for this standard ("the Module Handbooks") which referenced the learning outcomes ("see level 6 and level 7 Module Handbooks page 7"). The learning outcomes mapped to the "Knowledge and Skills Framework and to the Nursing and Midwifery Council Competencies for Nurse Prescribing (NMC, 2006)". The document stated that they were "underpinned by the HPC (2008) Standards of Conduct Performance and Ethics" however the visitors could not determine where the learning outcomes directly linked to HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate where in the programme curriculum the students are informed about the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence of the mechanisms in place that ensure that students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-26	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - Plymouth - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-04-26	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - Plymouth - SP - PT	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	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Stirling
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	1 March 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
 - School of Nursing Midwifery and Health: Quality and Standards
 - Admissions, Progress and Awards Committee (APAC) and Appeals Procedure
 - Raising and Escalating Concerns Procedure

- The Code of Practice for the Assessment and Examination
- Information regarding the School of Nursing Midwifery and Health's 'Equality and Diversity' and 'Disability' Policy.
- Fitness to Practice Policy
- Example of additional information for HPC registrants available on WebCT/Succeed
- Letter sent to the Designated Medical Practitioner
- Supervisors Guide
- Systematic and Detailed Examination in Practice
- Consultation Observation for Detailed Examination in Practice
- Portfolio of Evidence (includes Cause for Concern Process).

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 reviewed the evidence referenced in the completed SETs mapping document for this standard and noted the fitness to practise policy was from the School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health. The policy refers to the students "undertaking a professional nursing/midwifery programme" leading to "registration with the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC)". The visitors were aware there may be students on this programme who are working towards an annotation of the HPC Register who do not appear to be included in this policy document. The visitors require further evidence that there is a process in place for students who are not undertaking the professional nursing/midwifery programme.

Suggested documentation: Information that demonstrates students who are working towards an annotation of the HPC Register have a fitness to practise policy, or are clearly aware the school fitness to practise policy applies to them.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-10	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Stirling - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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 reviewed the evidence referenced in the completed SETs mapping document for this standard. The visitors noted the evidence referenced the HPC's Guidance on conduct and ethics for students. The visitors are aware students on this programme may be working towards annotation of the HPC register and so will already be on the HPC register, the standards of conduct, performance and ethics will be more applicable to them than the guidance for students. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate the programme curriculum is appropriate to the students when informing them about the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: Further information that demonstrates the students on the programme are being appropriately informed about the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-10	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Stirling - SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-04-10	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Stirling - SP - PT	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	University of Ulster
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Julia Cutforth (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HPC executive	David Christopher
Date of assessment day	28 March 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
 - Fitness to practice policy

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-28	a	EDU	RPT	AM report Ulster BSc Dietetics FT	Draft 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	University of Ulster
Programme title	MSc Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Julia Cutforth (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HPC executive	David Christopher
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 fitness to practice policy

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-28	a	EDU	RPT	AM report Ulster MSc Dietetics FT	Draft 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	University of Ulster
Programme title	Pg Dip Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Julia Cutforth (Physiotherapist) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HPC executive	David Christopher
Date of assessment day	28 March 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 fitness to practise policy

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-03-28	a	EDU	RPT	AM report Ulster Pg Dip Dietetics FT	Draft 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	University of Wales Institute Cardiff
Name of validating body	University of Wales
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Chiropodist /podiatrist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist/podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	28 February 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
 - Minutes from programme committee meetings 2009 -2011

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 that the education provider did not articulate how the programme meets this standard. From a review of the documentation provided the visitors could not find a student complaints process or any other evidence of how this standard could be met. The visitors noted that this standard was introduced in the academic year 2009 - 2010 and therefore has not previously been reviewed by the HPC. The visitors therefore require evidence of a student complaints process to demonstrate that this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: Student complaints 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 SETs mapping document the visitors noted reference to a consent form that students sign to demonstrate that they understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. From a review of the audit documentation the visitors were unable to locate any evidence, such as the student consent form, to demonstrate how this standard is met. The visitors noted that this standard requires the education provider to demonstrate how the curriculum makes sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Within the audit documentation the visitors noted the 'Professional Development 3' module (p 26 Programme Overview) where the module aims make reference to the dimensions of professional practice. However, to be assured that this standard is met the visitors require a clear outline of where students are made aware of the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics within the curriculum.

Suggested documentation: A clear outline of where the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum, including the student consent form.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-16	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - UWIC - BSc (Hons) CH - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

From a review of the additional documentation the visitors noted students are required to consent to state that they will abide by the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors also noted that the standards are covered within the 'Professional Development 1' module. However, the visitors felt that the education provider may want to consider revisiting the documentation to provide a stronger identification of how and where the standards are delivered and contextualised within the curriculum, perhaps including the standards within appropriate reading lists.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-16	d	EDU	RPT	AM report - UWIC - BSc (Hons) CH - 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	University of the West of Scotland
Programme title	Advanced Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist /podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	28 February 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
 - NMP and UWS Application forms
 - Module Descriptors for Advanced NMP, NMP (Theory), NMP (Practice)
 - Course Handbook
 - Course Timetable (September 2011)
 - Course Guidelines (levels 9 and 11)
 - NMP Course Leader CV

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: From a review of the SETs mapping document the visitors noted that the education provider stated that evidence of compliance with this standard was in section 12 of the Regulatory Framework document. The visitors noted that in the Regulatory Framework document it stated that details of profession-related conduct policies and processes should be outlined within individual programme handbooks. However, from a review of the programme handbook the visitors were unable to find reference to policies and processes relating to students' profession-related conduct. The visitors therefore require further evidence of policies and processes that are in place to deal with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of policies and processes that are in place to deal 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.

Reason: From a review of the audit submission the visitors noted that they had been supplied with an example of a students work to demonstrate that the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the programme. The visitors noted that this assessment referenced the HPC's standards of proficiency and not the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors were also unable to find reference to the HPC's ethical standards of conduct, performance and ethics within the assessment frameworks for the programme. To be assured that this standard is met the visitors require a clear outline of how students on the programme are made aware of the implications of HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested documentation: A clear outline of where the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-16	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - UWS - Advanced SP - PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-04-16	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - UWS - Advanced SP - PT	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	University of the West of Scotland
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist) Stephen Boynes (Diagnostic radiographer)
HPC executive	Victoria Adenugba
Date of assessment day	28 February 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
 - Employers Liaison Group Meeting Minutes
 - Faculty Enhancement Process Chart
 - University 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.

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

Reason: From a review of the Programme Annual Report 2010-2011, the visitors noted the statement that ‘Staff are delivering the programmes to significantly increased student numbers with a concomitant reduction in staff due to retirement and voluntary severance.’ The visitors were not presented with the evidence to support the changes to the programme student and staffing numbers or what effect these changes may have had on the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme. The visitors therefore require documentation which articulates how the programme continues to meet this SET.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the student numbers and the staffing of the programme team and clarification of what effect any changes have had on the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff delivering the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-03	c	EDU	RPT	AM report WoS BSc (Hons) ABMS FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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

In reviewing this submission the visitors noted that significant modifications are being proposed to the programme as stated in the 'Employees liaison group 15 Nov 2011'. The visitors would like the education provider to note that if changes are made to the way the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training the programme team needs to make HPC aware of the changes through the major change process. The visitors would also like the education provider to note that the HPC require a minimum of 6 months' notice to organise an approval visit if one is required.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-03	c	EDU	RPT	AM report WoS 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	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of Scotland
Programme title	Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Flexible Part time
Relevant entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist /podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
HPC executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	28 February 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
 - NMP and UWS Application form
 - Module Descriptors for Advanced NMP, NMP (Theory), NMP (Practice)
 - Course Handbook
 - Course Timetable (September 2011)
 - Course Guidelines (levels 9 and 11)
 - NMP Course Leader CV

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: From a review of the SETs mapping document the visitors noted that the education provider stated that evidence of compliance with this standard was in section 12 of the Regulatory Framework document. The visitors noted that in the Regulatory Framework document it stated that details of profession-related conduct policies and processes should be outlined within individual programme handbooks. However, from a review of the programme handbook the visitors were unable to find reference to policies and processes relating to students' profession-related conduct. The visitors therefore require further evidence of policies and processes that are in place to deal with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of policies and processes that are in place to deal 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.

Reason: From a review of the audit submission the visitors noted that they had been supplied with an example of a students work to demonstrate that the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the programme. The visitors noted that this assessment referenced the HPC's standards of proficiency and not the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors were also unable to find reference to the HPC's ethical standards of conduct, performance and ethics within the assessment frameworks for the programme. To be assured that this standard is met the visitors require a clear outline of how the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum.

Suggested documentation: A clear outline of where the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are covered within the curriculum.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-13	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - UWS - SP - Flex & PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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.
2012-04-13	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - UWS - SP - Flex & PT	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	York St John University
Programme title	BHSc (Hons) Physiotherapy In Service
Mode of delivery	Part time (in service)
Relevant part of HPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) David Houliston (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	1 March 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
 - Professional practice handbook
 - Student complaints procedure
 - Course participation regulations
 - Students standard review procedures

- Policy for student health and conduct
- Code of discipline for students and disciplinary procedures
- Staff CVs
- Letter from Yorks and Humber SHA

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: In reviewing the documentation provided the visitors noted in the 'Programme Evaluation 2010/ 2011' document a statement which articulated that the 2011 cohort would be the last on the programme due to '...the decision by the Yorkshire and Humber Strategic Health Authority to de-commission the programme'. The visitors also noted the statement 'Although there had been interest by prospective students for the 2012 intake the decision by the SHA to cease further funding for the programme after the 2011 intake no action was required to ensure the continued sustainability of the programme'. The visitors were not provided with evidence to support and explain this statement and as such were unclear as to what changes, if any, had occurred and how the programme continues to meet this standard. Therefore the visitors require documentation which articulates the position the programme has in the education provider's business plan and what effect, if any, the statements above have on how the programme continues to meet this SET.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the programme position in the education provider's business plan in relation to any arrangements in place for 'phasing out' the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-11	b	EDU	RPT	AM report York St J BHSc (Hons) PH PT (IS)	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

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

In reviewing the documentation provided the visitors noted in the 'Programme Evaluation 2010/ 2011' document a statement which articulated that the 2011 cohort would be the last on the programme due to '...the decision by the Yorkshire and Humber Strategic Health Authority to de-commission the programme'. The visitors also noted the statement 'Although there had been interest by prospective students for the 2012 intake the decision by the SHA to cease further funding for the programme after the 2011 intake no action was required to ensure the continued sustainability of the programme'. Due to these developments the visitors understand that recruitment to this programme has ceased for future years. However the visitors would like the education provider to note that while students will no longer be recruited to the programme it will still be subject to the HPC's monitoring process while the programme retains approval.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-04-11	b	EDU	RPT	AM report York St J BHSc (Hons) PH PT (IS)	Final DD: None	Public RD: None