

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Birmingham
Programme title	Doctorate in Forensic Psychology Practice (ForenPsyD)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Forensic psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Libby Payne (Forensic psychologist) Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of postal review	27 February 2017

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.

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

Reason: The visitors were able to review documentary evidence related to the staffing of the programme. From their review they were not able to determine the various responsibilities of the members of the programme team, and whether the number of staff would continue to be adequate for the delivery of an effective programme. They noted that a member of staff was due to retire and another was coming to the end of a fixed-term contract. They additionally noted that some of the teaching on the programme was carried out by visiting lecturers, or honorary tutors, and they were not able to see evidence relating to how much of the programme was taught in this way, or what mechanisms the education provider had in place to monitor and maintain the quality and experience of the visiting lecturers.

Suggested documentation: Evidence showing which members of staff have what teaching and other responsibilities on the programme, how much of the programme is taught by visiting lecturers, and how the qualifications and experience of visiting staff are monitored.

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

Reason: The visitors were able to review feedback from markers involved in assessment on the programme. They saw that there was some variation in this feedback from different markers. However, they not able to determine from the evidence provided how the moderation process for assessment on the programme worked, and so they could not be certain that this standard was met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence demonstrating how moderation of assessment on the programme is carried out.

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 Section 4 of the audit form had not been dated and signed, and would like to remind the education provider that this needs to be done to ensure that the HCPC annual monitoring process has an appropriate audit trail.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Birmingham
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicola Smith (Physiotherapist) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	28 July 2017

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
 - Staff list
 - Module guides
 - Qualifying physiotherapy programmes meeting agenda
 - Qualifying physiotherapy programmes meeting service user report
 - Service user & carers day presentation
 - Interview questions generated from service user & carers group
 - Interprofessional learning modules
 - Inter-professional education (IPE) competency framework

- Interprofessional education (IPE) steering group

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

Name of education provider	University of Birmingham
Programme title	Forensic Clinical Psychology Doctorate (ForenClinPsyD)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Forensic psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicola Bowes (Forensic psychologist) James McManus (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	20 June 2017

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
 - Course handbook
 - Entry requirements
 - Programme Committee minutes
 - Teaching including by experts by experience
 - End of placement assessment
 - Trainee logbook

- Staff curriculum vitae

There is no response to the external examiner reports for two years ago as there were no issues to respond to.

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted in their reading of the evidence provided that a number of staff have left. They also note that there have been plans to replace those staff members who have left, but from the evidence provided the visitors could not see if this is the case. As a result the visitors noted that the staff team appears to be reduced currently. As a result of this change the visitors are unclear as to how the education provider is ensuring that there continues to be sufficient numbers of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place. Therefore the visitors want to see additional evidence as to how the education provider is ensuring that there are adequate numbers of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme effectively.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates that there are sufficient staff to deliver an effective programme. This evidence could include the most recent programme management minutes to include student feedback.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences (Blood Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist) Doreen Shanks (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	28 June 2017

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
 - Service user documentation

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

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences (Genetics Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist) Doreen Shanks (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	28 June 2017

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
 - Service user documentation

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

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences (Cellular Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist) Doreen Shanks (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	28 June 2017

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
 - Service user documentation

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

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences (Infection Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist) Doreen Shanks (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	28 June 2017

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
 - Service user documentation

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

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Tracy Clephan (Dietitian) Pauline Douglas (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	11 July 2017

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
 - Service User Tool Kit
 - Service User group terms of reference
 - Curriculum vitae for 2 new staff members

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

Name of education provider	University of Manchester
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) Stephen Davies (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	10 July 2017

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 education provider has not included a response to either of external examiner reports because the examiner did not identify any areas of concern and so the education provider considered that a response was not therefore required.

- Minutes of Programme Commissioner's Annual Review meeting in February 2017
- Minutes of Programme Commissioner's Annual Review meeting in January 2016

- Clearing House entry for 2018 applicants
- Staff curriculum vitae
- BPS visit report, March 2017
- Revised Programme Handbook
- Information concerning new adult exam
- Example of previous adult examination paper

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 programme team has been pro-active in running its own quality assurance process whilst the education provider re-establishes its main quality systems. The visitors would recommend that the programme advise the HCPC through the monitoring processes when the quality assurance process for the education provider is in place.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Manchester
Programme title	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elspeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist) Graham Noyce (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	11 July 2017

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
 - Staff CVs
 - Programme handbook
 - Service user involvement information
 - Social work interventions course unit.

The education provider stated that no formal response to the external examiner was recorded two years ago, but that continual dialogue throughout the academic year was maintained.

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.

6.2 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the mapping document submitted as part of the audit, under SET 6.2, the education provider state that “Assessments have now been mapped against the Knowledge and Skills Statements from the Chief Social Worker for England”. While this was an appropriate external-reference framework against which to measure assessments, they could not see evidence in the documentation of this having been done, and so they were not able to determine that the standard had been met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence demonstrating how the education provider has mapped assessments against external-reference frameworks.

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	8
Section five: Visitors' comments	8

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Manchester
Programme title	Post Graduate Certificate in Applied Mental Health
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Approved Mental Health Professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elsbeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist) Graham Noyce (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	11 July 2017

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
- Staff and external examiner Curriculum vitae
- The Practice Learning Handbook 2016
- AMHP Practice Educator Training Slides
- Applied Psychiatry Timetable 2016
- Programme handbook

Responses to the EE reports have not been recorded. Ongoing dialogue between the academic team and the EEs take place throughout the year.

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

B.14 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place

Reason: The mapping document that accompanied the education provider's audit submission directed the visitors to page 20 of the Programme handbook to view a policy on attendance and monitoring. However, they could not see from reading this policy that the education provider had specifically identified where attendance is mandatory on this particular programme, and they were not clear what monitoring mechanisms were in place. They were therefore unable to determine whether the criterion had been met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensured that students were aware of the specific attendance requirements of this programme, and how this was monitored.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme

Reason: The education provider indicated in the mapping document that changes had been made affecting this criterion. However, the visitors were not clear about the nature of these changes, as the mapping document only referred to an updating of the Programme handbook. The visitors considered that the sections of the Programme handbook cited as evidence under this criterion did not enable them to determine whether the criterion had been met.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of whether the education provider has made changes to service user involvement on the programme, and if so, evidence to demonstrate that the learning outcomes still ensure that the criterion is met.

C.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the criteria in section 2

Reason: The education provider indicated in the mapping document that changes had been made affecting this criterion. However, the visitors were not clear about the nature of this change, as the mapping document only referred to an updating of the Programme handbook. The visitors considered that the sections of the Programme handbook cited as evidence under this criterion did not enable them to determine whether the criterion had been met.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of whether the education provider has made changes to the learning outcomes on the programme, and if so, evidence to demonstrate that the learning outcomes still ensure that the criterion is met.

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

Reason: The visitors noted that in the mapping document the education provider had indicated that they no longer used curriculum guidance from the College of Social Work (CSW) as that organisation no longer exists, and had directed the visitors to a section of the updated programme handbook. However, from this section, the visitors could not see what curriculum guidance the education provider now used instead of the CSW and so they were not able to be certain that the criterion was met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to clarify what curriculum guidance the education provider now uses in place of that previously provided by the College of Social Work.

C.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum

Reason: It was not clear to the visitors whether there had been any changes made to the programme regarding this criterion. In the mapping document, the visitors were directed to the Practice Learning Handbook as evidence, but they were unable to determine from the statement in this document whether the criterion was met. It may be that there have not been any changes regarding this criterion, but if there have been the visitors require evidence to show that it was met.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of whether the education provider has made changes to the programme that affect its ability to meet this criterion, and if so, evidence to demonstrate that the criterion was met.

C.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and / or the NMC's code: standards of conduct, performance and ethics for nurses and midwives on their practice as an AMHP

Reason: It was not clear to the visitors whether there had been any changes made to the programme regarding this criterion. In the mapping document, the visitors were directed to the programme handbook as evidence, but they were unable to determine from the statement in this document whether the criterion was met. It may be that there have not been any changes regarding this criterion, but if there have been the visitors require evidence to show that the criterion continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of whether the education provider has made changes to the programme that affect its ability to meet this criterion, and if so, evidence to demonstrate that the criterion continues to be met.

C.7 The delivery of the programme must encourage evidence-based practice

Reason: It was not clear to the visitors whether there had been any changes made to the programme regarding this criterion. In the mapping document, the visitors were directed to the Practice Learning Handbook as evidence, but they were unable to determine from the statement in this document whether the criterion was met. It may be that there have not

been any changes regarding this criterion, but if there have been the visitors require evidence to show that the criterion continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of whether the education provider has made changes to the programme that affect its ability to meet this criterion, and if so, evidence to demonstrate that the criterion continues to be met.

D.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme

Reason: It was not clear to the visitors whether there had been any changes made to the programme regarding this criterion. In the mapping document, the visitors were directed to the programme handbook as evidence, but they were unable to determine from the statement in this document whether the criterion was met. It may be that there have not been any changes regarding this criterion, but if there have been the visitors require evidence to show that it was met.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of whether the education provider has made changes to the programme that affect its ability to meet this criterion, and if so, evidence to demonstrate that the criterion was met.

D.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes

Reason: It was not clear to the visitors whether there had been any changes made to the programme regarding this criterion. In the mapping document, the visitors were directed to the Practice Learning Handbook as evidence, but they were unable to determine from the statement in this document whether the criterion was met. It may be that there have not been any changes regarding this criterion, but if there have been the visitors require evidence to show that the criterion continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of whether the education provider has made changes to the programme that affect its ability to meet this criterion, and if so, evidence to demonstrate that the criterion continues to be met.

D.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment

Reason: It was not clear to the visitors whether there had been any changes made to the programme regarding this criterion. In the mapping document, the visitors were directed to the Practice Learning Handbook as evidence, but they were unable to determine from the statements in this document whether any changes had been made, and therefore whether they needed to assess whether the criterion was still met. It may be that there have not been any changes regarding this criterion, but if there have been the visitors require evidence to show that the criterion continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of whether the education provider has made changes to the programme that affect its ability to meet this criterion, and if so, evidence to demonstrate that the criterion continues to be met.

D.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements

Reason: It was not clear to the visitors whether there had been any changes made to the programme regarding this criterion. In the mapping document, the visitors were directed to the Practice Learning Handbook as evidence, but they were unable to determine from the statements in this document whether any changes had been made, and therefore whether they needed to assess whether the criterion was still met. It may be that there have not been any changes regarding this criterion, but if there have been the visitors require evidence to show that the criterion continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of whether the education provider has made changes to the programme that affect its ability to meet this criterion, and if so, evidence to demonstrate that the criterion continues to be met.

D.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored

Reason: It was not clear to the visitors whether there had been any changes made to the programme regarding this criterion. In the mapping document, the visitors were directed to the Practice Learning Handbook as evidence, but they were unable to determine from the statements in this document whether any changes had been made to how the education provider ensures that placement providers are monitoring implementation of equality and diversity policies. It may be that there have not been any changes regarding this criterion, but if there have been the visitors require evidence to show the criterion continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of whether the education provider has made changes to the programme that affect its ability to meet this criterion, and if so, evidence to demonstrate that they monitored the placement provider's equality and diversity policies appropriately.

D.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting

Reason: It was not clear to the visitors whether there had been any changes made to the programme regarding this criterion. In the mapping document, the visitors were directed to the Practice Learning Handbook as evidence, but they were unable to determine from the statements in this document whether any changes had been made, and therefore whether they needed to assess whether the criterion was still met. It may be that there have not been any changes regarding this criterion, but if there have been the visitors require evidence to show the criterion continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of whether the education provider has made changes to the programme that affect its ability to meet this criterion, and if so, evidence to demonstrate that the criterion was continues to be met.

D.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience

Reason: It was not clear to the visitors whether there had been any changes made to the programme regarding this criterion. In the mapping document, the visitors were directed to the Practice Learning Handbook as evidence, but they were unable to determine from the statements in this document whether any changes had been made, and therefore whether they needed to assess whether the criterion was still met. It may be that there have not been any changes regarding this criterion, but if there have been the visitors require evidence to show the criterion continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of whether the education provider has made changes to the programme that affect its ability to meet this criterion, and if so, evidence to demonstrate that the criterion continues to be met.

D.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training

Reason: It was not clear to the visitors whether there had been any changes made to the programme regarding this criterion. In the mapping document, the visitors were directed to the Practice Learning Handbook as evidence, but they were unable to determine from the statements in this document whether any changes had been made, and therefore whether they needed to assess whether the criterion was still met. It may be that there have not been any changes regarding this criterion, but if there have been the visitors require evidence to show the criterion continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of whether the education provider has made changes to the programme that affect its ability to meet this criterion, and if so, evidence to demonstrate that the criterion continues to be met.

D.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed

Reason: It was not clear to the visitors whether there had been any changes made to the programme regarding this criterion. In the mapping document, the visitors were directed to the Employer Support Form as evidence, but they were not able to determine how the cited section of the form was intended to provide evidence that the education provider was meeting this criterion. They could not see whether any changes had been made, and therefore whether they needed to assess whether the criterion was still met. It may be that there have not been any changes regarding this criterion, but if there have been the visitors require evidence to show the criterion continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of whether the education provider has made changes to the programme that affect its ability to meet this criterion, and if so, evidence to demonstrate that the education provider was able to monitor the registration of practice placement educators.

D.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider

Reason: The visitors noted that the Programme Director is now a member of the Greater Manchester Social Work Academy (GMSWA), the education provider's collaborator in the

local teaching partnership. However, it was not clear to the visitors how this had affected the regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers, and whether there had been any change which affected the education provider's ability to meet the criterion. If there had been such a change, the document reference given in the programme handbook did not appear to link to appropriate evidence which would show that the education provider was still meeting the criterion.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of whether there has been any change to regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers, and if so how the education provider has ensured that such collaboration continues.

D.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

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

Reason: The visitors were not clear from the mapping document and the evidence provided whether the programme had made changes affecting their ability to meet this criterion. The visitors could not determine how some of the references given in the mapping document were related to this criterion, i.e. how they demonstrated that the education provider could ensure readiness for placement among students, placement educators and placement providers. If changes have been made affecting the education provider's ability to meet this criterion, the visitors had insufficient evidence to determine whether criterion the criterion continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of whether there has been any change to how the education provider ensures preparedness for placement, and if so, evidence to demonstrate how the education provider has continued to ensure such preparedness.

D.12 Learning, teaching and supervision must encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct

Reason: The visitors were not clear from the mapping document and the evidence provided whether the programme had made changes affecting their ability to meet this criterion. The visitors could not determine how some of the references given in the mapping document were related to this criterion, i.e. how they demonstrated that learning, teaching and supervision on the programme encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct. If changes have been made affecting the education provider's ability to meet this criterion, the visitors had insufficient evidence to determine whether the criterion continues to be met.

Suggested documentation: Clarification of whether there has been any change to how the education provider ensures safe and effective practice, independent learning, and

professional conduct, and if so, evidence to demonstrate how the education provider has continued to ensure this.

E.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme

Reason: The visitors were able to review the mapping document and the documentation provided. The education provider indicated in the mapping document that changes had been made, but the visitors could not see from the evidence provided whether the changes made had affected the education provider's ability to meet this criterion, because there was no information given about the previous way in which the standard had been met. They were therefore unable to determine whether the criterion had been met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence to clarify whether the education provider has made changes to the programme that affect its ability to meet this criterion, and if so evidence to demonstrate that the criterion was met.

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 approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes 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 their review of the audit, the visitors found it difficult to understand whether the education provider had made substantive changes to the programme that affected its ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals, or whether they had merely made minor administrative changes or changes to the programme documentation.

They would like to remind the education provider that for annual monitoring audits they are only required to highlight changes that affect how the programme meets the approval criteria for approved mental health professionals. The HCPC approves programmes on an ongoing basis, so we do not require education providers to demonstrate that they are meeting each of the AMHP criteria during our major change or annual monitoring processes.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Manchester
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker (in England)
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elspeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist) Graham Noyce (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	11 July 2017

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
 - Staff CVs
 - Programme handbook
 - Service user involvement information
 - Social work interventions course unit.

The education provider stated that no formal response to the external examiner was recorded two years ago, but that continual dialogue throughout the academic year was maintained.

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.

6.2 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.

Reason: The visitors noted that in the mapping document submitted as part of the audit, under SET 6.2, the education provider state that “Assessments have now been mapped against the Knowledge and Skills Statements from the Chief Social Worker for England”. While this was an appropriate external-reference framework against which to measure assessments, they could not see evidence in the documentation of this having been done, and so they were not able to determine that the standard had been met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence demonstrating how the education provider has mapped assessments against external-reference frameworks.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Manchester
Programme title	Doctorate in Counselling Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Counselling psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Tony Ward (Counselling psychologist) Stephen Fisher (Occupational psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	19 July 2017

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
 - Standards of proficiency log
 - Personal therapy logs
 - Service user and carer meeting minutes
 - Stakeholder meeting minutes
 - Refugee presentation flyer and email
 - Timetables

- A student's Abstract from Thesis

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 having reviewed the evidence provided agreed that the standards continue to be met. The visitors would like to remind the education provider to keep under review the service user and carer involvement in the programme, to develop their involvement further within the programme to further develop trainee involvement with them.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Manchester
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Vince Clarke (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	11 July 2017

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 handbook
 - Staffing Update (staffing update)
 - Service user involvement.
 - NSHCS Reaccreditation report – 28 July 2016

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

Name of education provider	University of Manchester
Programme title	MSc Audiology (with clinical competency certificate - CCC)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Vince Clarke (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	11 July 2017

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 Programme Handbook
 - MSc Course units

The education provider had a periodic review for the MSc Audiology and CCC programme in November 2014. Therefore, they were not required to complete the continuous monitoring proforma for the academic year 2014-15. Therefore there is no internal quality report included.

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

Name of education provider	University of Manchester
Programme title	Pg Dip Audiology (with clinical competency certificate - CCC)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Hearing aid dispenser
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Vince Clarke (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	11 July 2017

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 Programme Handbook
 - MSc Course units

The education provider had a periodic review for the MSc Audiology and CCC programme in November 2014. Therefore, they were not required to complete the continuous monitoring proforma for the academic year 2014-15. Therefore there is no internal quality report included.

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

Name of education provider	The Open University
Programme title	BA (Honours) Social Work (England)
Mode of delivery	Distance learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elspeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist) Graham Noyce (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	11 July 2017

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
- Social Work in England and Scotland, Prospectus 2016-17
- Online qualification description, BA (Hons) Social Work (England) (online only, see <http://www.open.ac.uk/courses/qualifications/q32>)
- Extracts from the Faculty of Wellbeing, Education and Language Studies Business Plan 2016-17
- Students First: OU Strategy for Growth
- Governance Structure Appendix
- Staff to student ratios

- List of starters and leavers since programme approval
- Staff Curriculum vitae
- Student Help Centre document
- Fitness to Practise procedure
- Terms of reference and 2016 Action Plan, England Service User and Carer Advisory Group
- Best Practice Guide for employers - student selection and practice learning
- Best Practice Guide for staff – working with service users and carers
- Tutor Guide, Part 2
- Practice Learning Guide (practice handbook)
- Statement of Assessment Policy and Procedure (SAPP) for the Appointment of external examiners

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

Name of education provider	The Open University
Programme title	Diploma in Higher Education in Paramedic Sciences
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Vince Clarke (Paramedic) Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	11 July 2017

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 Partnerships Report 2017 and Appendix
 - Service user and carer documentation

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

Name of education provider	The Open University
Programme title	Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Vince Clarke (Paramedic) Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	11 July 2017

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 Partnerships Report 2017 and Appendix
 - Service user and carer documentation

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

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth,
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Russell Hart (Therapeutic radiographer) Helen White (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	17 July 2017

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
 - Service user engagement VBR report
 - Supporting commentary for SET 3.17

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

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Linda Mutema (Diagnostic radiographer) Stephen Boynes Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	26 June 2017

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
 - Service User Engagement – Values Based Project
 - Service user involvement within recruitment document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The annual monitoring audit form indicated that the education provider's ten year history of participation in the joint delivery of a programme with another education provider – the Common Learning Programme (previously the New Generation Project), has come to an end. The audit form indicated that the common learning programme was a significant contributor to how interprofessional learning was achieved throughout the programme.

The audit form states that interprofessional learning activities remain within the Faculty but the visitors could not see any information of when, where or how this occurs for the programme. The audit form also states that the students mix with students from a range of different professions, however no evidence was provided to demonstrate how the interprofessional learning works for this programme. To ensure that this standard continues to be met, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates that the profession specific skills for the programme are being adequately addressed.

Additional documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how interprofessional learning for students on this programme is delivered. This could include examples of interprofessional learning activities and relevant module descriptors.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Reading
Programme title	MSc Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Caroline Sykes (Speech and language therapist) David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	10 May 2017

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
 - E mails from medical external examiner
 - PLMCP1 Introduction to Clinical Studies seminar schedule Summer term
 - PLMC11 Communication Impairment I -fluency course outline 2015
 - 21/04/16 Expert by Experience- Minutes of meeting
 - Service User Panel Policy
 - 29/9/16 Expert by Experience panel- Minutes of Meeting
 - PI1C1 feedback from meet the carers

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.

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

Reason: From a review of the external examiners' reports for the last two academic years, the visitors noted comments about the assessment and compensation of modules PLMCI1, PLMCI2 and PLMCI3. The visitors noted that the external examiner, for academic year 2014-15, had reservations about students being able to pass a whole module on average, despite failing a component of that module. The external examiner asked the programme team to consider if they are assessing "the relevant components" on the programme. In response to this report the education provider stated that they were looking for a resolution for the next academic year. However, the external examiners report for 2015-16 raised the same concern. The education provider responded to this concern by planning to review and redesign the programme in summer 2017. The redesign will include the detail that all components of all compulsory modules must be passed to complete the programme. The visitors noted Appendix 2 states that it is a 'course' outline but could also be a module timetable for 'PLMCI1', as such they could not definitively determine what information is outlined in this document. From the evidence provided, the visitors could not see how the education provider ensures that students on the programme who fail certain components within a module meet the standards of proficiency for speech and language therapists. As such, the visitors require evidence to show how the education provider ensures that those who fail a component of a module but who pass the programme meet the standards of proficiency and how that is assessed.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding how the education provider ensures that students who fail a component but pass the module demonstrate that they meet the standards of proficiency for speech and language therapists.

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

Reason: From a review of the external examiners' reports for the last two academic years the visitors noted comments about the assessment and compensation of modules PLMCI1, PLMCI2 and PLMCI3, on the programme. The visitors noted that the external examiner, for academic year 2014-15, had reservations about students being able to pass a module despite failing a component of that module. The external examiner asked the programme team to consider if they are assessing "the relevant components" on the programme. In response to this report, the education provider stated that they were looking for a resolution for the next academic year. However, the external examiners report for 2015-16 raised the same concern the following academic year. From the evidence provided, the visitors could see that there are monitoring and evaluation systems are in place. However they could not see how the education provider ensures that they act on the information provided to ensure appropriate standards in assessment. As such, the

visitors require evidence which demonstrates how the education provider responds to information provided through monitoring and evaluation processes, in a timely and effective manner.

Suggested documentation: Information demonstrating how the education provider responds appropriately to monitoring and evaluation processes.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	St George's, University of London
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Simon Dykes (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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 2016

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the audit form submitted by the education provider, but were not able to see the evidence referred to under SET 3.17. The document entitled “Definitive Document” did not appear to have been included in the submission. There were mentions of service user involvement in the programme. Section nine of the programme annual monitoring form for 2015-16 stated that service users and carers were involved in a Course Committee, and the programme specification stated that service users and carers were involved in admissions, and received appropriate training. However, the visitors were unclear how the service users and carers are trained and supported throughout their work with the programme. They therefore considered that more evidence of this involvement was required in order for them to be confident that the standard was met.

Suggested documentation: Evidence showing what training service users and carers receive for their involvement in admissions, or records relating to service users and carers’ involvement in the Course Committee.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University College London
Programme title	MSc Speech and Language Sciences
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elspeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist) Graham Noyce (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	11 July 2017

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 to External Examiners' Report 2014-2015
 - Appendix to External Examiners' Report 2015-2016
 - NHS Annual Report 2014-2015,
 - NHS Annual Report 2015-2016
 - Summary of Evaluation of Modules 2014-2015
 - Summary of Evaluation of Modules 2015-2016
 - Form for Service User Interview

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	4
Section five: Visitors' comments.....	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Suffolk
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic Science
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Simon Dykes (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	25 April 2017

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

Course has only been running for 18 months so documentation from two years ago is not available.

- Minutes of programme meetings
- Staff Curriculum vitae
- Evidence regarding service user and carer involvement

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.

5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Reason: From their review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider had highlighted a number of issues regarding placements, including communication difficulties between education providers and placement providers. They were not able to see evidence of what process the education provider had in place for ensuring that there were appropriate numbers of staff on placements, and considered that this could result in practice placements on the programme not having an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff, and so potentially causing problems for the students' ability to meet the standards of proficiency for paramedics.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of the audit process for placements, specifically relating to how they ensure adequate numbers of staff.

5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: From their review of the documentation, the visitors were not able to see evidence of what process the education provider had in place for ensuring that staff on placements had relevant knowledge, skills and experience, and considered that this could result in students on practice placements on the programme not meeting the learning outcomes for placements and so not meeting the standards of proficiency for paramedics.

Suggested documentation: Evidence showing how the training and skill level of placement staff is audited.

5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Reason: From their reading of the documentation (July 2016 minutes) the visitors became aware that there had been communication issues between the education provider and placement providers. They considered this could lead to a failure of students to achieve learning outcomes on placements because of lack of clarity about what was required of them or because placement providers were not clear what the education provider wanted students to achieve on placement.

Suggested documentation: Evidence showing how the education provider is collaborating with placement providers to address communication problems and ensure an effective working relationship.

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

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

Reason: From their reading of the documentation (July 2016 minutes) the visitors became aware that there had been communication issues between the education provider and placement providers. They considered this could lead to a failure of students, practice placement providers and placement staff to be fully prepared for placements, if students or placement staff were not informed of what learning outcomes needed to be achieved, how students ought to behave, how they would be assessed and how long placements would last. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate that they are working on improved communications, with a particular focus on adequate preparation.

Suggested documentation: Evidence showing how the education provider is collaborating with placement providers to address communication problems and ensure an effective working relationship.

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

With regard to audit of placements, the visitors considered that the standards were met overall, as the education provider were able to provide data on the numbers and qualifications of placement educators, and these numbers were appropriate. However, they did note that the numbers of registered educators on placements seemed relatively low compared with the student capacity on those placements. If the numbers were to fall further there might be a risk in future that students on placement are not appropriately assessed or supervised. They suggest therefore that this issue be revisited in future HCPC monitoring processes.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist) Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	11 July 2017

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.

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

Reason: From their review of the documentation provided the visitors noted the focus on module HSC-5028Y (Placement Education 2), alongside other modules, in the annual course monitoring and update report 2014-15. On page nine of this report there was a statement that included the sentence "...penalty points should not be applied for confidentiality breaches and in cases where the student has exceeded the word count, if this brings the mark below a fail then it should be capped at 40%." This then led to an action point to be taken forward which states that the programme team will "Flag up the importance of adhering to confidentiality to students and markers but advise that no penalties will be awarded". The visitors could therefore not see, from the evidence provided, how the programme team ensure that issues regarding breaches of confidentiality are highlighted, investigated and dealt with. In particular they could not see how the education provider would determine when and how breaches of confidentiality would lead to concerns about students' profession related conduct. Therefore the visitors require further evidence as to how and when breaches of confidentiality will be dealt with by the education provider and how any concerns about students' profession related conduct regarding these breaches will be dealt with.

Suggested documentation: Any policy that the education provider has in relation to breaches of confidentiality and documentation about how any concerns about students' profession related conduct related to breaches of confidentiality will be dealt with.

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 five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	11 July 2017

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
 - Fact sheet for applicants - 'What is expected of me as a student?'
 - Information document - reasonable adjustment panel
 - Occupational therapy engagement experiences document
 - Details of communication sessions with service users and carers
 - Service user and carer feedback form

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: From their review of the documentation provided the visitors noted the focus on module HSC-5028Y (Placement Education 2), alongside other modules, in the annual course monitoring and update report 2014-15. On page nine of this report there was a statement that included the sentence "...penalty points should not be applied for confidentiality breaches and in cases where the student has exceeded the word count, if this brings the mark below a fail then it should be capped at 40%." This then led to an action point to be taken forward which states that the programme team will "Flag up the importance of adhering to confidentiality to students and markers but advise that no penalties will be awarded". The visitors could therefore not see, from the evidence provided, how the programme team ensure that issues regarding breaches of confidentiality are highlighted, investigated and dealt with. In particular they could not see how the education provider would determine when and how breaches of confidentiality would lead to concerns about students' profession related conduct. Therefore the visitors require further evidence as to how and when breaches of confidentiality will be dealt with by the education provider and how any concerns about students' profession related conduct regarding these breaches will be dealt with.

Suggested documentation: Any policy that the education provider has in relation to breaches of confidentiality and documentation about how any concerns about students' profession related conduct related to breaches of confidentiality will be dealt with.

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

Reason: From their review of the documentation the visitors noted the focus on the national student survey (NSS) score in the annual course monitoring and update report 2015-16. On page 18, item six, a statement is included to explain the NSS score which says that "...we lost a large proportion of the OT team during this period and the staff changes could have resulted in a change to the student satisfaction." However, from the evidence provided the visitors could not see what changes there had been to the number of staff available to deliver this programme, and what proportion of staff have relevant occupational therapy qualifications and experience. Therefore the visitors require further evidence as to the number of appropriately qualified and experience staff in place and how the education provider ensures that there is an adequate number of staff in place to deliver the programme effectively.

Suggested documentation: Further documentation detailing the number, qualifications and experience of the staff who are available to deliver this programme effectively.

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 education provider has a reasonable adjustment panel and that there is a process to determine if an applicant would need to be subject to this panel or not. This information was accompanied by a flyer which provides information about the physical requirements of working within occupational therapy. In reviewing this evidence the visitors were happy that the panel was operational across the school and that it would play a role in determining which applicants would be offered a place on the programme. However, to strengthen the document the visitors feel that it could include references to HCPC's guidance 'Health, disability and becoming a health and care professional' and relevant equality and diversity law. This may then enhance the information that is provided to panel members and potential applicants by providing more context for the work of the panel.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Speech and language therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Elspeth McCartney (Speech and language therapist) Graham Noyce (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	11 July 2017

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
- Documents relating to service user involvement –
- SLT Quinquennial Course Review;
- Report from the Course Review Panel;
- Summary of Service User Consultation (part of the Course Review process)

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	11 July 2017

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
 - Evidence documents to demonstrate how SET 3.17 is met

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

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme title	MSc Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist) Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive	Ben Potter
Date of assessment day	11 July 2017

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
 - Enquiry based learning examples one and two
 - Interviewer assessment guidance document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided, the visitors were aware that internal quality monitoring reports are generated as part of the regular monitoring and evaluation of the programme. They noted as part of the process of creating this report the feedback from the external examiners is used to provide responses and generate action plans for programme improvement. However, the visitors were unclear as to how the regular monitoring and evaluation systems for this programme helps to produce the Annual Course Monitoring and Update report. In particular the visitors noted that the Annual Course Monitoring and Update report 2014-15, section 4, page 7 included external examiner feedback that did not relate to this programme. Instead this feedback and the comments were about an alternative master's programme at the education provider. Therefore the visitors were unclear about how the regular monitoring and evaluation systems are operating as intended to produce the internal quality monitoring reports. As such the visitors require further information about the regular monitoring and evaluations systems that are in place for the programme. In particular this evidence should demonstrate how the external examiner comments for this programme were included in a relevant internal quality monitoring report and have been responded to and acted upon.

Suggested documentation: Information regarding the regular monitoring and evaluation systems that are in place and information about how the 2014-15 external examiner feedback for this programme has been responded to and acted upon.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme title	Foundation Degree Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Vince Clarke (Paramedic) Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	11 July 2017

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
 - Condensed Critical Evaluation Document

Section three: Additional documentation

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

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From their reading of the evidence provided in this audit, the visitors could not see any evidence that indicated how service users and carers were involved in the programme. As a result it was also unclear what support and training the education provider provides to those service users and carers who are involved in the programme. Therefore the visitors could not determine how this standard was met. As such the visitors require evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme and how they are trained and supported within their role.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme and how they are trained and supported within this role to demonstrate that this standard is met.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Vince Clarke (Paramedic) Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	11 July 2017

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
 - College of Paramedics (COP) accreditation agenda
 - Placement assessment document
 - Interview forms
 - Module specifications

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.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From their reading of the evidence provided in this audit, the visitors could not see any evidence that indicated how service users and carers were involved in the programme. As a result it was also unclear what supported and training the education provider provides to those service users and carers who are involved in the programme. Therefore the visitors could not determine how this standard was met. As such the visitors require evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme and how they are trained and supported within their role.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in the programme and how they are trained and supported within this role to demonstrate that this standard is met.

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.