

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Association of Clinical Scientists
<b>Programme title</b>	Certificate of Attainment
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Flexible
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Clinical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer) Patrick Kimmitt (Clinical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors noted that the 'third party review reports' included the names of the candidates taking the assessment. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that the HCPC does not require reports containing personal details and that they should provide anonymised reports in the future. In this way the education provider may be better placed to protect the personal details of those candidates taking the assessment.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Birmingham City University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer) Patrick Kimmitt (Clinical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Birmingham City University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Therapeutic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Birmingham City University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Elsbeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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



## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Birmingham City University
<b>Programme title</b>	DipHE Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Susan Lennie (Dietitian) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Canterbury Christ Church University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Canterbury Christ Church University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Gail Stephenson (Orthoptist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors would like the education provider to consider role emerging placements as a possible response to the practice placement capacity pressures.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Canterbury Christ Church University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner) Elaine McCurrach (Prosthetist / orthotist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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



## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Canterbury Christ Church University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- This pathway started in April 2011. Due to the internal external examiner processes and timeframes there are no external examiner reports or responses available for this annual monitoring submission.

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Canterbury Christ Church University
<b>Programme title</b>	DipHE Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner) Elaine McCurrach (Prosthetist / orthotist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	London Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition and Dietetics
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Dietitian
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Susan Lennie (Dietitian) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - BSc Human Nutrition and Dietetics, 2011 Course Catalogue, Course Specification
  - Faculty of Life Sciences Business Plan 2011-2013
  - Staff Curriculum Vitae's
  - Job Description for Principal lecturer (Subject Group Co-ordinator)

- Draft Single Performance Review Scheme 2011/12
- School of Human Sciences Undergraduate Food, Nutrition and Dietetic Course Committee Meeting Minutes
- School of Human Sciences UG performance enhancement meeting (Review of 2011/12 pre resit)
- Consent to participate as service users during practical and clinical teaching - Information Sheet
- Summary of Practice Educator feedback (September 2011 – June 2012)
- Summary of Student feedback - September 2011 – June 2012
- NHS London Contract Performance Management
- Annual report 2011/12 Human Nutrition and Dietetics
- Placement Approvals Process
- Details of major changes to placement provision
- Student disciplinary regulations - interim procedure 2012/13
- External Examiner contracts

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	London Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Dietetics and Nutrition
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Dietitian
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Susan Lennie (Dietitian) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - MSc/PG Dietetics and Nutrition, 2012/13 Course Catalogue
  - MSc/PG Dietetics and Nutrition Course Handbook
  - Faculty of Life Sciences Business Plan 2011-2013
  - Staff Curriculum Vitae's
  - Job Description for Principal lecturer (Subject Group Co-ordinator)

- Draft Single Performance Review Scheme 2011/12
- School of Human Sciences Undergraduate Food, Nutrition and Dietetic Course Committee Meeting Minutes
- School of Human Sciences UG performance enhancement meetings - Review of 2011/12 pre resit and Review of 2011/12
- Consent to participate as service users during practical and clinical teaching - Information Sheet
- Summary of Practice Educator feedback (September 2011 – June 2012)
- Summary of Student feedback - September 2011 – June 2012
- NHS London Contract Performance Management
- Annual report 2011/12 Human Nutrition and Dietetics
- Placement Approvals Process
- Details of major changes to placement provision
- Student disciplinary regulations - interim procedure 2012/13
- External Examiner contracts

The internal quality reports, external examiners reports and responses to external examiner reports are not available as the programme has only been running since September 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.



## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	London Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Human Nutrition and Dietetics
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Dietitian
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Susan Lennie (Dietitian) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - MSc Human Nutrition and Dietetics, 2010/11 Course Catalogue
  - MSc/PG Dip Human Nutrition and Dietetics Course Handbook
  - Faculty of Life Sciences Business Plan 2011-2013
  - Staff Curriculum Vitae's
  - Job Description for Principal lecturer (Subject Group Co-ordinator)

- Draft Single Performance Review Scheme 2011/12
- School of Human Sciences Undergraduate Food, Nutrition and Dietetic Course Committee Meeting Minutes
- School of Human Sciences UG performance enhancement meeting (Review of 2011/12 minutes and the pre-resit meeting minutes)
- Consent to participate as service users during practical and clinical teaching - Information Sheet
- Summary of Practice Educator feedback (September 2011 – June 2012)
- Summary of Student feedback - September 2011 – June 2012
- NHS London Contract Performance Management
- Annual report 2011/12 Human Nutrition and Dietetics
- Placement Approvals Process
- Details of major changes to placement provision
- Student disciplinary regulations - interim procedure 2012/13
- External Examiner contracts

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	London Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	PGDip Human Nutrition and Dietetics
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Dietitian
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Susan Lennie (Dietitian) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - MSc Human Nutrition and Dietetics, 2010/11 Course Catalogue
  - MSc/PG Dip Human Nutrition and Dietetics Course Handbook
  - Faculty of Life Sciences Business Plan 2011-2013
  - Staff Curriculum Vitae's
  - Job Description for Principal lecturer (Subject Group Co-ordinator)

- Draft Single Performance Review Scheme 2011/12
- School of Human Sciences Undergraduate Food, Nutrition and Dietetic Course Committee Meeting Minutes
- School of Human Sciences UG performance enhancement meeting (Review of 2011/12 pre resit)
- Consent to participate as service users during practical and clinical teaching - Information Sheet
- Summary of Practice Educator feedback (September 2011 – June 2012)
- Summary of Student feedback - September 2011 – June 2012
- NHS London Contract Performance Management
- Annual report 2011/12 Human Nutrition and Dietetics
- Placement Approvals Process
- Details of major changes to placement provision
- Student disciplinary regulations - interim procedure 2012/13
- External Examiner contracts

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	London Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	Post Graduate Diploma Dietetics and Nutrition (Pre-registration)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Dietitian
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Susan Lennie (Dietitian) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - MSc/PG Dietetics and Nutrition, 2012/13 Course Catalogue
  - MSc/PG Dietetics and Nutrition Course Handbook
  - Faculty of Life Sciences Business Plan 2011-2013

- Staff Curriculum Vitae's
- Job Description for Principal lecturer (Subject Group Co-ordinator)
- Draft Single Performance Review Scheme 2011/12
- School of Human Sciences Undergraduate Food, Nutrition and Dietetic Course Committee Meeting Minutes
- School of Human Sciences UG performance enhancement meeting (Review of 2011/12 pre resit)
- Consent to participate as service users during practical and clinical teaching - Information Sheet
- Summary of Practice Educator feedback (September 2011 – June 2012)
- Summary of Student feedback - September 2011 – June 2012
- NHS London Contract Performance Management
- Annual report 2011/12 Human Nutrition and Dietetics
- Placement Approvals Process
- Details of major changes to placement provision
- Student disciplinary regulations - interim procedure 2012/13
- External Examiner contracts

The internal quality reports, external examiners reports and responses to external examiner reports are not available as the programme has only been running since September 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.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Manchester Metropolitan University
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Applied Biomedical Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Biomedical scientist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Document: Impact of Modernising Scientific Careers on MSc ABMS

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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



## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Oxford Brookes University
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Gail Stephenson (Orthoptist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Appendix 1: Changes to staffing statement
  - Appendix 2: VLE Change to Moodle from Blackboard
  - Appendix 3: Revised module descriptions and Programme specification

The programme started and enrolled its first cohort in 2012 so there are no external examiner's reports or internal quality reports completed at this time.

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Oxford Brookes University
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Elspeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
  - Internal quality report for one year ago
  - Internal quality report for two years ago
  - External examiner's report for one year ago
  - External examiner's report for two years ago
  - Response to External examiner's report one year ago
  - Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- The programme started and enrolled its first cohort in 2012 so there are no external examiner's or internal quality reports completed or available.

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	St George's, University of London
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer) Patrick Kimmitt (Clinical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	St George's, University of London
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Therapeutic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Information regarding to a change to the scheme of assessment for TR205Y Radiotherapy and Oncology II

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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



## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	St George's, University of London
<b>Programme title</b>	Foundation Science Degree in Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Brian Ellis (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Staffordshire University
<b>Name of awarding / validating body</b>	Coventry University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Outreach)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time (In service)
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Gail Stephenson (Orthoptist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Staffordshire University
<b>Name of awarding / validating body</b>	University of Keele
<b>Programme title</b>	DipHE Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Susan Lennie (Dietitian) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Item A: HCPC confirmation of change to Award Lead
  - Item B: Amended Award Handbook

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Staffordshire University
<b>Programme title</b>	Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Minutes from Education and Training Committee Panel Meeting
  - CV for Kevin Armstrong
  - Module Descriptors
  - Pharmacology and Therapeutic Interventions for Out of Hospital Care – HEN 62016-5

- Paramedic Practice & Role Development – HEN 62018-5

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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



## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Staffordshire University
<b>Programme title</b>	Foundation Degree in Professional Development in Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Minutes from Education and Training Committee Panel Meeting
  - CV for Kevin Armstrong
  - Module Descriptors
  - Pharmacology and Therapeutic Interventions for Out of Hospital Care – HEN 62016-5

- Paramedic Practice & Role Development – HEN 62018-5

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Staffordshire University
<b>Programme title</b>	Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- There are no internal quality reports, external examiner reports or responses to the external examiner reports for two years ago as the programme had not run and therefore this documentation is unavailable.

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University Campus Suffolk
<b>Name of awarding / validating body</b>	Universities of East Anglia and Essex
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Oncology and Radiotherapy Technology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Therapeutic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Chester
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Nutrition and Dietetics
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Dietitian
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Susan Lennie (Dietitian) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Appendix I – Minutes of senate
  - Appendix IV – Consent policy
  - Appendix V – BDA Revalidation letter
  - Appendix VI – Quality Visit and Audit Tool

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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



## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Chester
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Prescribing
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Chester
<b>Programme title</b>	PG Dip Nutrition and Dietetics
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Dietitian
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Susan Lennie (Dietitian) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Appendix I – Minutes of senate
  - Appendix IV – Consent policy
  - Appendix V – BDA Revalidation letter
  - Appendix VI – Quality Visit and Audit Tool

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Cumbria
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer) Patrick Kimmitt (Clinical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Revised student complaints procedure
  - Revised fitness to practice procedure
  - Curriculum vitae for new programme leader
  - Revised module descriptors for practice placement 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.

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted from the HCPC audit form provided and from reading the annual programme monitoring reports that responses to external examiner reports had been made. However the education provider had not included the relevant external examiner reports for the two years annual monitoring. In order for the visitors to be assured that the external examiners reports are reviewed as part of the regular monitoring and evaluation of the programme, they would like to review the external examiner reports for the programme for the period covered by this audit.

**Suggested documentation:** External examiner reports for the period covered by this audit.

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

**Reason:** From the two annual programme monitoring reports provided by this audit period the visitors read that there had been issues regarding staffing for both years. Although there was an action plan at the end of both reports, neither mentioned how the staffing issue was to be addressed. The visitors were concerned that this could impact on how this standard continued to be met.

**Suggested documentation:** Evidence to demonstrate how the programme team have ensured that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

#### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Cumbria
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Elspeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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



### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors noted in the SET mapping document the programme has made significant changes to the modules content and the programme has gone through revalidation in April 2013. Because HCPC annual monitoring reviews the programme over the past two academic years this change does not fall within the remit of this year's annual monitoring. The visitors consider these changes may have an impact on how the programme continues to meet the SETs. The visitors therefore wish to remind the education provider that changes such as this should be submitted to the HCPC via the major change process. For this change the notification and documentation should be submitted as soon as is possible.

The visitors also noted through the documentation some concerns regarding the state of the physical facilities. The visitors appreciated that actions have been taken to address these issues. They are also aware that further actions may need to be undertaken. The visitors noted the programme should ensure all the physical resources for the programme are fit for purpose.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Cumbria
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Occupational Therapy (Accelerated route)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Gail Stephenson (Orthoptist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Cumbria
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Physiotherapy (pre registration, Accelerated route)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Elspeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors noted in the SET mapping document the programme has made significant changes to the modules content and the programme has gone through revalidation in April 2013. Because HCPC annual monitoring reviews the programme over the past two academic years this change does not fall within the remit of this year's annual monitoring. The visitors consider these changes may have an impact on how the programme continues to meet the SETs. The visitors therefore wish to remind the education provider that changes such as this should be submitted to the HCPC via the major change process. For this change the notification and documentation should be submitted as soon as is possible.

The visitors also noted through the documentation some concerns regarding the state of the physical facilities. The visitors appreciated that actions have been taken to address these issues. They are also aware that further actions may need to be undertaken. The visitors noted the programme should ensure all the physical resources for the programme are fit for purpose.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of East Anglia
<b>Programme title</b>	DipHE Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner) Elaine McCurrach (Prosthetist / orthotist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

In the SETs mapping document under SET 3.14, the education provider referred to the schools 'Fitness to Practice' policy. From a review of this policy, the visitors noted that the HCPC is still referenced as 'HPC'. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that name of the regulator has changed from the Health Professions Council to the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC). The education provider should consider updating this to avoid any confusion.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Exeter
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Medical Imaging (Diagnostic Radiography)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Appendix 7 Medical imaging brochure
  - Appendix 8 Language requirements
  - Appendix 9 College manager contact details



- Appendix 10 Monitoring and evaluation procedures
- Appendix 11 New staff CVs
- Appendix 12 Module descriptors
- Appendix 13 CPD
- Appendix 14 Forum learning spaces
- Appendix 15 Senior tutor role
- Appendix 16 Tutorials
- Appendix 17 Revised award weighting
- Appendix 18 New external examiner 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.

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

**Reason:** The visitors note the annual monitoring submission included details of a change to the weighting of the marks contributing to the degree classification (Appendix 17, revised award weighting). The information provided indicated a change from 50:50 weighting of theory and practice to 33:67. There was no further clarification as to which weightings relates to the theory aspects and to the practice aspects. The visitors considered this could impact on the students passing the practice aspects of the programme depending on where the weighting lies. The visitors require further clarification of the weightings for the degree classifications.

**Suggested documentation:** Information that clarifies the distribution of the weightings of the marks contributing to the degree classification.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Leicester
<b>Programme title</b>	DipHE in Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner) Elaine McCurrach (Prosthetist / orthotist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Programme periodic development review (PDR) report
  - Initial response to PDR
  - Extract from Programme Information Paragraph 16.11
  - Senate Regulations – extract 5
  - Senate Regulations – extract 7

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

In the documentation submitted, the education provider noted the recent Internal Periodic Development Review (PDR), and the changes to the programme that have been recommended following this review. These changes could impact on the way that the Standards of Education and Training (SETs), specifically SET 4 Curriculum, SET 5 Practice placements, and SET 6 Assessment continue to be met. As the education provider has informed the HCPC in the SETs mapping document that these changes have not been implemented, the visitors would like to remind the education provider that if there are any changes to the programme which impact upon the way the SETs are met, that the HCPC is informed through the major change process.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Portsmouth
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer) Patrick Kimmitt (Clinical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Portsmouth
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Therapeutic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Matthew Nelson
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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



## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Portsmouth
<b>Programme title</b>	DipHE Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner) Elaine McCurrach (Prosthetist / orthotist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Portsmouth
<b>Programme title</b>	FdSc Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Brian Ellis (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Reading
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Elspeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Reading
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Speech and Language Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Elspeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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



## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Salford
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Diagnostic radiographer
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer) Patrick Kimmitt (Clinical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - SOP Mapping document
  - CoR re-approval letter

- Programme Specification & Table of Assessments mapped to programme learning outcomes
- Attendance Pattern
- Sample Trigger)
- Clinical Tutor Job Description
- Programme Amendment Document
- Student Clinical Handbook
- Programme Handbook
- Induction Checklist
- Screenshot from Placement VLE
- Personal Development Planning (PDP) Strategy
- Module Specifications
- Research Informed Teaching Experience
- Evidence based practice
- Article – Towards a research informed teaching experience within a diagnostic radiography curriculum, Higgins et al 2012
- The 7 stage PBL process
- Year 3 Student Guide
- Assessment and Feedback for Taught Programmes
- Academic Regulations for Taught Programmes 2012/2013
- Professional Practice Handbooks (Year 1, 2 & 3)
- Professional skills assessment sheet Example from University based OSCE
- Moderation Report
- Record of Verification of Assessments
- Programme Design, Approval, Amendment Review and Withdrawal (Academic Appeals Procedure
- External Examining for Taught Programmes

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

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

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

### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors were satisfied that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). However, the visitors wished to point out that the comprehensive nature of the submission was not entirely conducive to come to their decision. The visitors articulated that 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 subsequent work, is not necessary for any future HCPC annual monitoring audit.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Salford
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Gail Stephenson (Orthoptist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - SOP's Mapping Document
  - COT Benchmark Curriculum Mapping Document
  - Programme Specification
  - Programme Handbook Module Specifications

- Contributing to the Evidence base of OT timetable
- Team Post Graduate Teaching Qualification Status
- HCPC Major Change form and Response
- Assessment Handbook 2012 2013
- Assessment and Feedback for Taught Awards
- Academic Regulations for Taught Programmes 2012 2013
- COT pre registration Education Standards
- Learning Agreements
- Fitness for Professional Practice
- Programme Design, Approval, Amendment, Review and Withdrawal
- Academic Appeals Procedure
- External Examining of all Taught Programmes

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors were satisfied that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). However, the visitors wished to point out that the comprehensive nature of the submission was not entirely conducive to come to their decision. The visitors articulated that 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 subsequent work, is not necessary for any future HCPC annual monitoring audit.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Salford
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Chiropodist / podiatrist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Brian Ellis (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Podiatry Programme Handbook
  - HCPC SOPs Mapping Document
  - Med Handbook 2011-12

- Clinical Practice Marking Matrix
- HCPC SET Mapping Document
- Academic Appeals Procedure
- Periodic Programme Review and Re-approval (PPRR)
- QAC Handbook (SET 4.2)
- Programme Handbook Section A
- Programme Specification
- Module Specifications
- HCP Guidance on Conduct Performance and Ethics
- Level 4, 5 & 6 Clinical Logs / Portfolio
- Assessment and Feedback for Taught Awards
- Internal Verification and Moderation
- Academic Regulations for Taught Programmes
- School Programme Handbook B
- Assessment and LO Mapping
- Foundation Medicine Handbook
- Clinical Practice Marking Matrix
- School Moderation reports (Written/Oral/Viva)
- School Verification of Assessments record template
- Programme Design Approval Amendment Review and Withdrawal
- Academic Appeals Procedure
- External Examining of all Taught Programmes

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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



Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors noted in the 'annual programme monitoring & enhancement report 2011/12' the programme has made structural changes, "The new structure commences Feb 2013 for PT and Sept 2013 for FT students". Because HCPC annual monitoring reviews the programme over the past two academic years this change does not fall within the remit of this years' annual monitoring. The visitors consider these changes may have a significant impact on how the programme continues to meet the SETs. The visitors note the education provider should submit any documentation regarding this change to HCPC via the major change process as soon as possible.

The visitors were satisfied that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). However, the visitors wished to point out that the comprehensive nature of the submission was not entirely conducive to come to their decision. The visitors articulated that 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 subsequent work, is not necessary for any future HCPC annual monitoring audit.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Salford
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Prosthetist / orthotist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner) Elaine McCurrach (Prosthetist / orthotist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Programme specification
  - Module specifications
  - BAPO guidelines mapping document and guidelines
  - Programme handbooks

- College amendment forms (CAFs)
- Internal verification and moderation
- Academic regulations for taught programmes (2012 – 2013)
- School moderation reports
- Programme design, approval, amendment, review and withdrawal
- Academic appeals procedure
- Students results letter
- External examining for all taught programmes

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors were satisfied that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). However, the visitors wished to point out that the comprehensive nature of the submission was not entirely conducive to come to their decision. The visitors articulated that 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 subsequent work, is not necessary for any future HCPC annual monitoring audit.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Salford
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 6)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Flexible
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Brian Ellis (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Salford
<b>Programme title</b>	Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 7)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Flexible
<b>Relevant entitlement</b>	Supplementary prescribing
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Brian Ellis (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Robert Dobson (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	4 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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



## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Sheffield
<b>Programme title</b>	B.Med Sci (Hons) Speech
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Elspeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Sheffield
<b>Programme title</b>	MMED Sci Clinical Communication Studies
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Elsbeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Pauline Etkin (Music therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Information about a programme leader change including CV
  - Appendices 4–6 – module changes:
    - Appendix 4 – IPLU3
    - Appendix 5 – IPLU
    - Appendix 6 –Therapeutic Process MH

### 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.

#### 4.9 When there is inter-professional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

**Reason:** With the removal of the inter-professional module (IPLU3), the visitors noted from the documentation that inter-professional skills are now being taught in the existing academic and placement modules and they reviewed the rationale for the removal of IPLU3. However, as the visitors did not see the module descriptors for those modules within the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine that profession-specific skills and knowledge of this professional group is being adequately addressed and that this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information to demonstrate profession specific skills and knowledge that were taught in the inter-professional module (IPLU 3) are adequately addressed in existing academic and clinical modules within the curriculum.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) Jeanette Seaman (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Information about a programme leader change including CV
  - Appendices 9-12 – module changes:

- Appendix 9 - IPLU3
- Appendix 10 – IPLU
- Appendix 11 – FoHs
- Appendix 12 – CMN and SCG

### 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.

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

**Reason:** The education provider has detailed changes to the way in which the interprofessional aspects of the programme are being delivered (Appendix 9). The interprofessional module has been integrated into the clinical practice placement modules of the programme. These modules are not credit bearing modules however there continues to be assessment associated with the interprofessional learning. The documentation provided for the core modules did not include information about the procedural management of this change for the students or placements. The visitors considered this change to have a potential impact on students and their the placement setting and the students and thus should have been considered in terms of the educational aspects as a core module, the impact on service users at placements and the impact on students' learning and assessment when considering the credit weighting. The visitors also considered communication of these changes to be important to ensure clarity for all parties involved.

**Suggested documentation:** In reaching rationalisation of interprofessional learning modules and clinical placement modules evidence that input from placement providers and students has been incorporated together with information regarding how these changes have been fully disseminated. The visitors require evidence demonstrating the structure of the new curriculum incorporating credit weightings, practice placement module durations and how these fit into the overall programme plan.



#### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Chiropodist / podiatrist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Gwyn Thomas (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Louise Devlin
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Curriculum vitae for Ivan Bristow (Lecturer)
  - Major change notification form (submitted December 2011)
  - Minutes from the Curriculum Approval Committee (September 2012)
  - Rationale for losing IPLU3 from the AHP curricula in 2012/13
  - Module descriptors

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

#### **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:** With the removal of the interprofessional module (IPLU3), the visitors noted from the documentation that interprofessional learning outcomes are now being taught in the clinical module (PODY3007). However, as the visitors did not see the module descriptor for the clinical module within the documentation, the visitors cannot be assured that the learning outcomes associated with interprofessional learning are being adequately addressed and therefore they are unable to determine that the standards of proficiency are fully addressed within the current modules.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information regarding the clinical module and the realignment of the learning outcomes.

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted from the documentation that the credit points for the interprofessional modules (IPLU1001, 2001 and 3003) have been reduced to zero. The visitors could not see from the documentation if all the modules have to be passed in order to successfully complete the programme, regardless of the number of credits. As the modules listed above are now non-credit bearing, the visitors seek further clarification regarding the assessment of these modules to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme have met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

**Suggested documentation:** Further documentation is required to demonstrate that the assessment strategy and design continues to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme have met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register, following the introduction of IPLU modules 1001, 2001 and 3003 as non-credit bearing.

#### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Pauline Etkin (Music therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Information about a programme leader change including CV
  - Appendices 4–6 – module changes:
  - Appendix 4 – IPLU3

- Appendix 5 – IPLU
- Appendix 6 –Therapeutic Process MH

### 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 audit submission provided included external examiner reports and responses for the undergraduate BSc (Hon) Occupational Therapy programme; however external examiner reports and responses for this programme were not identified. The visitors could not determine whether the external examiner reports and responses submitted were also applicable for this programme or if there are other reports for these programmes which were not included as part of this audit submission. In order to determine that there are effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place for this programme the visitors require further information about the external examiner reports and responses for this programme.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information about the external examiner reports and responses or copies of the reports and responses.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

## **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors noted from the documentation that it appears that this programme is not currently running. They would like to remind the education provider that when the programme starts to run again, if there are any changes to the programme that may impact the SETs such as updates made to the curriculum to reflect developments within the profession, to inform the HCPC via the major change process.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme title</b>	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) Jeanette Seaman (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Information about a programme leader change including CV
  - Appendices 9-12 – module changes:
  - Appendix 9 - IPLU3



- Appendix 10 – IPLU
- Appendix 11 – FoHs
- Appendix 12 – CMN and SCG

### 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.

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

**Reason:** The education provider has detailed changes to the way in which the interprofessional aspects of the programme are being delivered (Appendix 9). The interprofessional module has been integrated into the clinical practice placement modules of the programme. These modules are not credit bearing modules however there continues to be assessment associated with the interprofessional learning. The documentation provided for the core modules did not include information about the procedural management of this change for the students or placements. The visitors considered this change to potentially have impact on the placement setting and the students and thus should have been considered in terms of the educational aspects as a core module, the impact on service users at placements and the impact on students' learning and assessment when considering the credit weighting. The visitors also considered communication of these changes to be important to ensure clarity for all parties involved.

**Suggested documentation:** In reaching rationalisation of interprofessional learning modules and clinical placement modules evidence that input from placement providers and students has been incorporated together with information regarding how these changes have been fully disseminated. The visitors require evidence demonstrating the structure of the new curriculum incorporating credit weightings, practice placement module durations and how these fit into the overall programme plan.

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

**Reason:** The audit submission provided included external examiner reports and responses for the undergraduate BSc (Hon) Physiotherapy programme, however external examiner reports and responses to those reports for this programme were not identified. The visitors could not determine whether the external examiner reports and responses submitted were also applicable for this programme or if there are other reports for these programmes which were not included as part of this audit submission. In order to determine that there are effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place for this programme the

visitors require further information about the external examiner reports and responses for this programme.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information about the external examiner reports and responses or copies of the reports and responses.

#### **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 it appears this programme is not currently running. The visitors consider that before the programme runs again, the education provider may decide to make changes to the programme that may impact the SETs, such as updates to the curriculum to reflect developments within the profession. The visitors note the education provider should inform the HCPC via the major change process of any changes made to the programme before the programme runs again.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme title</b>	Postgraduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Pauline Etkin (Music therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Information about a programme leader change including CV
  - Appendices 4–6 – module changes:
  - Appendix 4 – IPLU3

- Appendix 5 – IPLU
- Appendix 6 –Therapeutic Process MH

### 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 audit submission provided included external examiner reports and responses for the undergraduate BSc (Hon) Occupational Therapy programme; however external examiner reports and responses for this programme were not identified. The visitors could not determine whether the external examiner reports and responses submitted were also applicable for this programme or if there are other reports for these programmes which were not included as part of this audit submission. In order to determine that there are effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place for this programme the visitors require further information about the external examiner reports and responses for this programme.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information about the external examiner reports and responses or copies of the reports and responses.

### Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

## **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors noted from the documentation that it appears that this programme is not currently running. They would like to remind the education provider that when the programme starts to run again, if there are any changes to the programme that may impact the SETs such as updates made to the curriculum to reflect developments within the profession, to inform the HCPC via the major change process.

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme title</b>	PG Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) Jeanette Seaman (Speech and language therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	11 April 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Information about a programme leader change including CV
- Appendices 9-12 – module changes:
- Appendix 9 - IPLU3
- Appendix 10 – IPLU

- Appendix 11 – FoHs
- Appendix 12 – CMN and SCG

### 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.

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

**Reason:** The education provider has detailed changes to the way in which the interprofessional aspects of the programme are being delivered (Appendix 9). The interprofessional module has been integrated into the clinical practice placement modules of the programme. These modules are not credit bearing modules however there continues to be assessment associated with the interprofessional learning. The documentation provided for the core modules did not include information about the procedural management of this change for the students or placements. The visitors considered this change to potentially have impact on the placement setting and the students and thus should have been considered in terms of the educational aspects as a core module, the impact on service users at placements and the impact on students' learning and assessment when considering the credit weighting. The visitors also considered communication of these changes to be important to ensure clarity for all parties involved.

**Suggested documentation:** In reaching rationalisation of interprofessional learning modules and clinical placement modules evidence that input from placement providers and students has been incorporated together with information regarding how these changes have been fully disseminated. The visitors require evidence demonstrating the structure of the new curriculum incorporating credit weightings, practice placement module durations and how these fit into the overall programme plan.

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

**Reason:** The audit submission provided included external examiner reports and responses for the undergraduate BSc (Hon) Physiotherapy programme, however external examiner reports and responses to those reports for this programme were not identified. The visitors could not determine whether the external examiner reports and responses submitted were also applicable for this programme or if there are other reports for these programmes which were not included as part of this audit submission. In order to determine that there are effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place for this programme the

visitors require further information about the external examiner reports and responses for this programme.

**Suggested documentation:** Further information about the external examiner reports and responses or copies of the reports and responses.

#### **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 it appears this programme is not currently running. The visitors consider that before the programme runs again, the education provider may decide to make changes to the programme that may impact the SETs, such as updates to the curriculum to reflect developments within the profession. The visitors note the education provider should inform the HCPC via the major change process of any changes made to the programme before the programme runs again.



## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of the West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme title</b>	Foundation Degree Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full Time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	6 June 2013

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Programme Specification Handbook
  - Module Specification (examples)
  - Placement Educators Handbook
  - Professional Practice Portfolio Year 1 and 2
  - Paramedic Programme 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.

### **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.