

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Bedfordshire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	04 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13742-F3F3W5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Christine Hirsch	Independent prescriber
Paul Bates	Paramedic
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 April 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07601

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: As evidence for this standard, the education provider submitted a short narrative which stated that the programme lead was a registered paramedic and noted that they had submitted an “application for change of course lead submitted 31/1/19 to HCPC online”. The visitors considered that the education provider did not appear to have understood the requirements of the new standard. Education providers need to

demonstrate to the HCPC that they have an effective process for ensuring that a newly appointed programme leader is an appropriate person for the role unless alternative arrangements are in place. The visitors did not see evidence relating to such a process and so they could not determine whether the standard was met. Therefore they require the education provider to submit further evidence of the process.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating that the education provider has a process for ensuring that the persons appointed to the role have overall professional responsibility for the programme as appropriate.

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

3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Reason: In their evidence the education provider included a document “HCPC HSS Nov 2018”, which was the record of a meeting discussing the education provider’s professional, statutory and regulatory bodies (PSRB) monitoring. One issue highlighted in this document was a concern that the staffing situation on the programme had “deteriorated” since the start of 2018. It also mentioned that there was only one registered paramedic on the programme team, who was the Course Co-ordinator, and that other core staff were from the Nursing and Midwifery programmes. The document stated a concern that staff illness or absence might lead to the programme not continuing to meet the standards of education and training. The visitors noted these concerns and were not able to see what the education provider was doing to ensure the programme continued to have an adequate number of staff who had appropriate expertise to deliver all curriculum areas, for example this could include a plan for further recruitment, or a plan showing how all necessary areas could be covered with existing staff, whether visiting lecturers or staff from the Nursing and Midwifery programmes. They were therefore unable to determine whether this standard was met, and require the education provider to submit evidence demonstrating how the programme has continued to be effectively delivered with existing staff.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing that all aspects of the curriculum are delivered by appropriately qualified staff with appropriate specialist knowledge and expertise.

Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Birmingham
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), FT (Full time)
Date submission received	06 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13745-G2Q2R5

Contents

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

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Andrew Hill	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 52
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07608

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Brighton
Validating body	University of Brighton
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, FT (Full time)
Date submission received	30 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13768-W0R5J9

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Carol Rowe	Physiotherapist
Valerie Maehle	Physiotherapist
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 March 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 80
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07628

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In their submission the education provider has provided the curriculum vitae of an allocated person with overall responsibility for the programme. However, this standard is about whether there is a process in place for appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person with overall responsibility to the programme. The

visitors were unable to determine from the programme documentation that there is a clear procedure for appointing such a person.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates what the process is for appointing the person who holds overall professional responsibility for the programme.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: In their submission, the education provider has made reference to shared learning being used as a method to facilitate interprofessional learning. The visitors noted that a conference is held to address interprofessional learning. However, the visitors were unclear what other professions take part in the conference and how the education provider will ensure that the conference is delivering the interprofessional learning outcomes. Therefore, visitors were unable to determine how learners will be able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates what other professions attend the conference, how the conference is structured and how interprofessional learning is facilitated during the conference.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Brighton
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice, Full time
Date submission received	01 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13762-L1F8L8

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Christine Hirsch	Independent prescriber
Paul Bates	Paramedic
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07636

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In their evidence the education provider submitted a narrative of recent changes in the programme leader position and referred to a recent major change process which informed the HCPC of a change of programme leader. However, there did not appear to be evidence contained in the submission relating to the process for ensuring that a newly appointed programme leader was suitable and if it becomes necessary a suitable replacement for the programme. The visitors were therefore

unable to determine whether the standard had been met, and require further evidence to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating that the education provider has a process for ensuring that person appointed to have overall professional responsibility for the programme are appropriate.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: In their evidence for this standard the education provider submitted documents relating to a number of aspects of practice-based learning including audit, staff training, evaluation, and mentor availability. However, in the evidence provided there was no information available about what process the education provider has in place to ensure that appropriate and sufficient practice-based learning is and continues to be available to all learners. They were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met. The visitors therefore require further information about the education provider ensures availability and capacity.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that there is sufficient availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Bristol
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate of Educational Psychology (D.Ed.Psy.), Full time
Date submission received	01 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13764-K6K0V7

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Gordon Burrow	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Lisa Marks Woolfson	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate of Educational Psychology (D.Ed.Psy.)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Educational psychologist
First intake	01 January 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07638

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider confirmed Rob Green as the current

programme director. As this standard has been revised it now requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Brunel University London
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, FT (Full time)
Date submission received	09 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13789-K1B0K2

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	5

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Mary Hannon-Fletcher	Biomedical scientist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 1997
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 145
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07639

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had informed us Linda Maskill and Anne McIntyre were joint Division Directors for the programme and had provided information about staffing on the programme.

This standard requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional

responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

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

Reason: The visitors were made aware from the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the number of staff on the programme has reduced from 17 FTE in September 2017 to 13 FTE in August 2018. The visitors were also made aware five posts to start in February 2019 were out for advertisement. From the information provided, the visitors could not determine whether the resources provided for the programme would allow for an appropriate number of staff who are able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively. As such the visitors need further information how there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested evidence: Information to justify the number of staff in place in relation to the practical requirements of the programme, the number of learners, their needs and the learning outcomes to be achieved.

3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Reason: The visitors were made aware from the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the number of staff on the programme has reduced from 17 FTE in September 2017 to 13 FTE in August 2018. The visitors were also made aware five posts to start in February 2019 were out for advertisement. From the information provided, the visitors could not determine whether educators have the necessary knowledge and expertise to deliver their parts of the programme effectively. As such the visitors need further information subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Suggested evidence: Information to ensure educators are suitable and well equipped to take part in teaching and to support learning in the subject areas they are involved in.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had informed us there is a process in place for learners to raise concerns. The visitors saw that this information was related to circumstances relating to learners themselves. The visitors were not able to find information about how learners were able to raise concerns specifically when they believe the safety and wellbeing of service users is at risk. This standard requires the education provider has an effective process in place. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has to support and enable learners to raise concerns when learners believe the safety and wellbeing of service users is at risk.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Brunel University London
Name of programme(s)	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), FT (Full time)
Date submission received	23 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13790-N1L4C3

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	6

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Mary Hannon-Fletcher	Biomedical scientist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 75
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07641

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had informed us they undertake an annual monitoring review. This process requires that staff employed in managing and leading the programme are suitably qualified and experienced.

This standard requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional

responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

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

Reason: The visitors were made aware from the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the number of staff on the programme has reduced from 17 FTE in September 2017 to 13 FTE in August 2018. The visitors were made aware there were a limited number of staff able to teach on the programme. The visitors were also aware posts to start in February 2019 were out for advertisement. From the information provided, the visitors could not determine whether the resources provided for the programme would allow for an appropriate number of staff who are able and equipped to deliver the programme effectively. As such the visitors need further information how there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested evidence: Information to justify the number of staff in place in relation to the practical requirements of the programme, the number of learners, their needs and the learning outcomes to be achieved.

3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Reason: The visitors were made aware from the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the number of staff on the programme has reduced from 17 FTE in September 2017 to 13 FTE in August 2018. The visitors were also made aware five posts to start in February 2019 were out for advertisement. From the information provided, the visitors could not determine whether educators have the necessary knowledge and expertise to deliver their parts of the programme effectively. As such the visitors need further information subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Suggested evidence: Information to ensure educators are suitable and well equipped to take part in teaching and to support learning in the subject areas they are involved in.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Reason: The visitors were made aware that there was a reference to HPC within Study Block Outline for module OT5710. The visitors thought this reference to a previous name for HCPC within the learning resources for learners meant the module outline lacked clarity for learners and other individuals who would have access to it. The education provider must review its documentation to correctly refer to HCPC, to provide clear reference to ourselves.

Suggested evidence: Information that references to HPC are up-to-date and, if appropriate, amended.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had informed us there is a process in place for learners to raise concerns. The visitors saw that this information was related to circumstances relating to learners themselves. The visitors were not able to find information about how learners were able to raise concerns specifically when they believe the safety and wellbeing of service users is at risk. This standard requires the education provider has an effective process in place. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has to support and enable learners to raise concerns when learners believe the safety and wellbeing of service users is at risk.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: In a review of the documentation for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors were made aware learners were taught by lecturers from different disciplines including physiotherapy, social work and psychology and that some modules are shared with other professional groups. The visitors were also made aware learners were able to engage with the occupational therapy student conference. The visitors were not able to see information about whether learners engage with learners of other professions. The visitors require further information about how learners work together with other professionals and learners, and across professions.

Suggested evidence: Information to demonstrate how learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: In a review of the documentation for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors were made aware that as part of the 'Preparing for the Workplace' modules learners are introduced to standards of professional behaviour, code of conduct and performance and ethics. However, the visitors were not able to see how the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics are assessed. As such, the visitors require more information about how learners are able to demonstrate they understand and are able to meet the expectations associated with being a regulated professional.

Suggested evidence: Information about how assessment ensures learners understand and are able to meet HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Coventry and University of Warwick
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin.Psy), Full time
Date submission received	20 December 2018
Case reference	CAS-13801-V2C2F9

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Antony Ward	Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist
Lincoln Simmonds	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin.Psy)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 1998
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 17
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07643

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the mapping document which described a process for appointing a new programme leader. However, the education provider did not appear to have submitted any further evidence relating to the process for appointing a new programme leader and so the visitors were unable to determine whether the process was effective and appropriate.

Suggested evidence: Evidence relating to the process by which the education provider ensures that, in the event that a new programme leader has to be appointed, that person is appropriately experienced and qualified.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Coventry University
Name of programme(s)	Practice Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (Level 3), Part time Practice Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (M Level), Part time Conversion Course From Supplementary to Independent Non-Medical Prescribing (Non-Accredited), Part time Practice Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (Level 3), Part time Practice Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (M Level), Part time
Date submission received	01 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13832-K2G2H6

Contents

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

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Gemma Howlett	Paramedic
Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Practice Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (Level 3)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 October 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07666

Programme name	Practice Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (M Level)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 October 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07667

Programme name	Conversion Course From Supplementary to Independent Non-Medical Prescribing (Non-Accredited)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 December 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07675

Programme name	Practice Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (Level 3)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 October 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07676

Programme name	Practice Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (M Level)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 October 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07677

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Cumbria
Name of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (level 7) (Conversion), Part time Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (level 6) (Conversion), Part time University Award Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (level 6) (with SP pathway and IP pathway), Part time University Award Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (level 7) (with SP pathway and IP pathway), Part time University Award Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (level 6) (Supplementary Prescribing), Part time University Award Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (level 7) (Supplementary Prescribing), Part time
Date submission received	29 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13781-L0J4P7

Contents

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

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Alaster Rutherford	Independent prescriber
Matthew Catterall	Paramedic
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (level 7) (Conversion)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07682

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (level 6) (Conversion)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)

Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07683

Programme name	University Award Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (level 6) (with SP pathway and IP pathway)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07685

Programme name	University Award Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (level 7) (with SP pathway and IP pathway)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07686

Programme name	University Award Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (level 6) (Supplementary Prescribing)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07687

Programme name	University Award Non-Medical Prescribing for AHPs (level 7) (Supplementary Prescribing)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07688

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPG annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Derby
Name of programme(s)	MSc Occupational Therapy, FT (Full time) PG Dip Occupational Therapy, FT (Full time)
Date submission received	17 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13839-G6J4K8

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	5

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Mary Hannon-Fletcher	Biomedical scientist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07692

Programme name	PG Dip Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 August 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07702

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had informed us Helen Roberts became programme leader from July 2018. This standard requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were made aware of various aspects of how the education provider monitors practice-based learning environments, external meetings the placement team had, and minutes of meetings with placement educators. However, the visitors were not able to see the process the education provider has in place to make sure all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs. As such, the visitors need to be sure there is an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has to make sure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were made aware that learners are taught about the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). However, the visitors were not able to see how the SCPEs are assessed within the programme. As such, the visitors require more information about how learners are able to demonstrate they understand the expectations associated with being a regulated professional.

Suggested evidence: Information about how assessment ensures learners understand and are able to meet our standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Derby
Name of programme(s)	MA Dramatherapy, Full time
Date submission received	18 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13844-F9B9V1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	6

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Belinda Sherlock	Arts therapist - Dramatherapist
Karen Harrison	Physiotherapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA Dramatherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Dramatherapist
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07697

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: In the SETs mapping document, for this standard the education provider did not indicate whether any changes had to been made to how the programme meets this standard. As this section was not filled in, the visitors could not be sure whether the education provider has made any changes to how they meet this standard, and whether

any additional evidence should have been provided. As such, visitors require clarification about whether the education provider has made any changes to how the programme meets this standard.

Suggested evidence: A statement that clearly indicates whether any changes have been made that impact how the programme meets this standard, and if changes have been made, evidence to demonstrate how the programme continues to meet this standard.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider has stated that Kate Smith is the confirmed programme leader and this was approved by HCPC through the major change process. However, as this is a new standard we no longer require information about the person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme, instead we require information which demonstrates there is an effective process in place to appoint an appropriate person, and if necessary, a suitable replacement. The education provider has not provided information about the process they have in place to identify a suitable person, and so the visitors require further information to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which demonstrates there is an effective process in place to identify an appropriate person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programme, and if necessary, a suitable replacement.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider stated that 'Due to the addition of the MA music therapy programme at Derby, there have been discussions and meetings between programme leads regarding placement capacity in the region. However as we are the only dramatherapy programme in the region, we are still able to meet the capacity of practice-based learning.' The education provider also provided a list of dramatherapy programme providers. This is a new standard, and we now require the education provider to evidence what process they have in place to ensure that all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs. From the information provided, the visitors could not see evidence of a process in place to ensure continued availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners on the programme. As such, the visitors require further information to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the process the education provider has in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider referred to guidance about safeguarding concerns in the student handbook. The visitors found that safeguarding

processes were well documented within the evidence provided, however the visitors were not clear how the safeguarding policies ensure that learners are aware of the process for raising concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, and what support is in place to enable them to do so. This is a new standard, and we now require the education provider to demonstrate how they help learners to recognise situations where service users may be at risk, how they support them in raising concerns and how they make sure action is taken in response to those concerns. The visitors have not seen information which demonstrates this, and therefore require further information to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider provided a document which demonstrates how expectations of professional behaviour, including conduct, performance and ethics are included through various learning outcomes. On reviewing the documentation provided, the visitors could not see any reference to HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. This standard requires that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors found that without referring learning to HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics, learners may not be aware of these, which would impact on their understanding, and whether they are able to meet those standards. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about how the learning outcomes will ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates that the learning outcomes will ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectation of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider states that this is constantly assessed throughout the programme, particularly the placement module, and noted the learning outcomes of the clinical placement one module. On review of the module, the visitors could not see any specific reference to HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. This standard requires that learners demonstrate that they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors found that without referring learning to HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics, learners may not be aware of these, which would impact on their understanding, and whether they are able to meet those standards. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about how assessment throughout the programme will ensure that learners are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates that learners are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	De Montfort University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Human Communication - Speech and Language Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Human Communication - Speech and Language Therapy, Part time BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	07 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13794-Y5F4J8

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Lorna Povey	Speech and language therapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Human Communication - Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2000
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07706

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Human Communication - Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07709

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 October 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07710

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had provided us with the curricula vitae of Lisa Morgan and Adam Brown, and informed us the current programme leader is registered with the HCPC. This standard requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Greenwich
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (London), Full time
Date submission received	21 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13796-L8M4S8

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

David Whitmore	Paramedic
James Pickard	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 January 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07714

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (London)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07715

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes	
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The education provider noted in the documentation that this is an oversight and will be provided for the 2018-19 reporting period.

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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

Reason: For this audit, the HCPC required the education provider to submit monitoring of service user and carer involvement for the last two years. The education provider has provided some information in relation to the involvement of service users and carers on the programmes through the teaching of the IPE module. However, the visitors noted it states “No documentation in respect of the specific monitoring of service user and carer involvement is provided”. Whilst the education provider has identified this is an oversight and will be rectified for the 2018-19 University reporting period. This is a requirement for the current annual monitoring audit. As this information was not provided the visitors were unable to establish how service user and carer involvement was monitored and evaluated, and if any areas have been identified for further development and whether a resulting action plan has been put in place. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence of the monitoring of service user and carer involvement, for the last two years.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence of the monitoring of service user and carer involvement, for the last two academic years.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider states “there is a flowchart in the programme handbook which details the process for raising concerns with the university”. However, as the programme handbook was not provided as part of the audit submission the visitors were unable to review the concerns process. As such, the visitors could not determine whether there is an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate what the process is for supporting and enabling learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, and how the learners have access to this information should they need to refer to it.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, and how learners have access to this information.

Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Name of programme(s)	Practice Certificate in Independent Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals, Part time Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for Diagnostic Radiographers and Dietitians, Part time
Date submission received	04 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13859-B9D7B0

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Christine Hirsch	Independent prescriber
Paul Bates	Paramedic
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Practice Certificate in Independent Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07718

Programme name	Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing for Diagnostic Radiographers and Dietitians
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 January 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07719

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes	
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The education provider did not submit this documentation, see additional evidence request under standard B.15 below.

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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

Reason: In their evidence, the education provider included the curriculum vitae of a service user who is involved in teaching on the programme. The visitors considered that this could be appropriate involvement. However, it was not clear from the information provided how extensive the service user's involvement was, or how monitoring of the service user involvement was carried out. The education provider did not submit evidence relating to monitoring of service user and carer involvement from the last two academic years (2016-17) and (2017-18), which all education providers have been asked to provide as part of annual monitoring audits from the 2018-19 academic year. It was therefore not clear to the visitors to what extent the service user was involved in teaching, and how their involvement was evaluated and, if necessary, improved. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence relating to service user and carer involvement, specifically how it is planned, evaluated and improved.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing how the education provider monitors service user and carer involvement in the programme, and how information generated by this monitoring is used to improve the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	28 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13861-N1V3M1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Robert Keeble	Biomedical scientist
Jacqueline Waterfield	Physiotherapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07721

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider said that learners undertake training in safeguarding across the programme both in specific mandatory training elements, online CPD, and within appropriate taught modules. For evidence, the education provider showed an example of mandatory training element in relation to CPD. The example shows a covering page of a 'Safeguarding adults level 1' e-learning module, which is mandatory training for all learners. The education provider did not provide information about what is contained within this module. Without understanding what information would be provided in this e-learning module, or any other information that is provided the learners about raising concerns, the visitors could not determine whether this standard is met. From the information provided, the visitors could not determine what support is in place to enable learners to raise concerns, or what process they should follow if they were to raise concerns. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Full time
Date submission received	06 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13862-V2B0F5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Lorna Povey	Speech and language therapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2000
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07723

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the education provider informed us Elaine Long is the programme leader. This standard requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

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

Reason: The education provider informed us there had been no changes to the way the programme meets this standard. As part of the standard documentation provided by the education provider, the visitors were able to view external examiners reports and responses for academic year 2017-2018. However, the visitors were not able to find the standard documentation of the external examiners report(s) and response(s) for academic year 2016-17. The visitors were therefore unable to see how the education provider monitors and evaluates the programme's quality and effectiveness and the systems that are in place, in order to deliver overall quality and effectiveness on an ongoing basis.

Suggested evidence: The education provider should submit the external examiners report(s) and response(s) for the academic year 2016-17.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences), Full time
Date submission received	06 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13800-C8Y9Y1

Contents

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

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Jacqueline Waterfield	Physiotherapist
Robert Keeble	Biomedical scientist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2013
Last intake	30 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07724

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Huddersfield
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, FT (Full time)
Date submission received	27 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13804-F1V2T7

Contents

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

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07729

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Huddersfield
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	06 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13871-Z6T2S0

Contents

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

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Jacqueline Waterfield	Physiotherapist
Robert Keeble	Biomedical scientist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1997
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07732

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Hull
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD), FT (Full time)
Date submission received	30 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13809-H2R7B1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
First intake	01 January 1992
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07736

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has provided the curriculum vitae of an appropriate and experienced person who holds overall professional responsibility for this programme, However, this standard now requires the education provider to demonstrate there is a process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As the visitors could not see any evidence of what process is in place to identify a suitable person or a replacement for this post, they could not determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing the process in place to recruit a programme leader, such as recruitment processes, job descriptions and/or person specifications.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Hull
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences), FT (Full time)
Date submission received	28 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13810-L3S7V2

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	5

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Mary Hannon-Fletcher	Biomedical scientist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07738

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had informed us no changes made in this area. This standard requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had informed us no changes made in this area. However, this is a new standard, and while the programme may not have changed the way they do this, previously we have not required evidence on how the programme meets the standard. This standard requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners. From the information provided the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to make sure all learners in the programme have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the education provider provided a placement agreement which outlines the responsibilities of the education provider and the practice education provider in regards to the provision of practice-based learning. The visitors were not able to find information about how learners were able to raise concerns specifically when they believe the safety and wellbeing of service users is at risk during the programme. This standard is about having an effective process to support and enable learners raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users which covers all parts of the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has to support and enable learners to raise concerns, when learners believe the safety and wellbeing of service users is at risk.

4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: In a review of the documentation the visitors were made aware expectations of professional behaviour were established in the programme handbook in conjunction with placement agreement. The education provider indicated evidence to demonstrate this was contained in the programme handbook and the learning agreement. However, the visitors did not see evidence of how the learning outcomes ensure learners understand and are able to meet the expectations associated with being a registered professional. As such, the visitors require the education provider to provide information

on how professional conduct and in particular the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) are taught throughout the programme.

Suggested evidence: Information on how learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: From the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors were made aware evidence about how learners are able to learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions could be found in the programme handbook. However, on a review of the documentation the education provider submitted, they were unable to find information on how learners are prepared to work with other professionals and across professions for the benefit of service users and carers. As such, the visitors were not able to fully determine whether and how learners currently engage with other professionals and across learners in other relevant professions.

Suggested evidence: Information to demonstrate how learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: In a review of the documentation for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors were informed the programme handbook and placement agreement introduced learners to standards of conduct and performance and ethics. However, the visitors were not able to see how learners are able to demonstrate that they understand the expectations associated with being a regulated professional by the time they complete the programme. As such, the visitors require more information about how assessment throughout the programme ensures learners are able to demonstrate they understand the expectations associated with being a regulated professional.

Suggested evidence: Information about how assessment ensures learners understand and are able to meet our standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Institute of Biomedical Science
Name of programme(s)	Certificate of Competence (Non-accredited degree followed by Registration Training Portfolio), Flexible Certificate of Competence (Degree followed by Registration Training Portfolio), Flexible Certificate of Competence by Equivalence (Biomedical Scientist), Flexible Certificate of Competence (Degree containing the Registration Training Portfolio), Flexible
Date submission received	08 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13811-T0F4S4

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	6

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Jacqueline Waterfield	Physiotherapist
Robert Keeble	Biomedical scientist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Certificate of Competence (Non-accredited degree followed by Registration Training Portfolio)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 150
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07741

Programme name	Certificate of Competence (Degree followed by Registration Training Portfolio)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)

Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 250
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07742

Programme name	Certificate of Competence by Equivalence (Biomedical Scientist)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 100
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07743

Programme name	Certificate of Competence (Degree containing the Registration Training Portfolio)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 300
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07744

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes

Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes
--	-----

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: For the Certificate of Competence by Equivalence (Biomedical Scientist), the education provider has said that the Executive Head of Education continues to be the programme leader and this is represented in the annual monitoring report to the Institute's Education and Professional Standards Committee. This is a revised standard, and we now require evidence which demonstrates there is an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. Information about this process has not been included, therefore the visitors require further evidence to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the process the education provider has in place to identify a suitable person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: For the Certificate of Competence (Degree followed by Registration Training Portfolio) the education provider has said this is not applicable, as no changes have been made to how they meet the standard. However, this is a revised standard, and so we require the education provider to provide evidence of how they meet this standard, even though they may not have made changes in order to meet the standard. We now require evidence which demonstrates there is an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. Information about this process has not been included, therefore the visitors require further evidence to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the process the education provider has in place to identify a suitable person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: For the Certificate of Competence (Degree containing the Registration Training Portfolio), the education provider has said this is not applicable, as no changes have been made to how they meet the standard. However, this is a revised standard, and so we require the education provider to provide evidence of how they meet this standard, even though they may not have made changes in order to meet the standard. We now require evidence which demonstrates there is an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. Information about this process has not been included, therefore the visitors require further evidence to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the process the education provider has in place to identify a suitable person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: For the Certificate of Competence (Non-accredited degree followed by Registration Training Portfolio) the education provider has said this is not applicable, as no changes have been made to how they meet the standard. However, this is a revised standard, and so we require the education provider to provide evidence of how they meet this standard, even though they may not have made changes in order to meet the standard. We now require evidence which demonstrates there is an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. Information about this process has not been included, therefore the visitors require further evidence to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the process the education provider has in place to identify a suitable person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: For the Certificate of Competence by Equivalence (Biomedical Scientist), the education provider has said that this is an experiential route for individuals who are already working at a level equivalent to registration. This is a new standard, and the education provider has said there are no changes made as the candidate is responsible for gathering their own evidence from their previous experiences and training or agreeing a training plan with their employer / mentor.

This standard requires the education provider to demonstrate how the experience of learners is central to the quality and effectiveness of the programme. By 'involved in the programme' we mean that learners must be able to contribute to the programme in some way. We do not specify the exact areas of the programme which learners must be involved in, but they could be involved in some or all of the following:

- Design
- Delivery
- Review

From the information provided, the visitors could not determine how learners are involved in the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which demonstrates learners are involved in the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	King's College London
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	06 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13815-M3T4X9

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	3

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Jacqueline Waterfield	Physiotherapist
Robert Keeble	Biomedical scientist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1991
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 78
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07748

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: In the SETs mapping form for this standard, the education provider explained that learners undertake interprofessional learning at all levels of the programme. However, the visitors could not find supporting evidence which demonstrates how this takes place on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the programme will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which demonstrates how the programme will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Leeds
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic), Full time
Date submission received	01 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13818-X4M9Z3

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Joanne Lusher	Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist
Linda Mutema	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 August 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 55
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07753

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPG annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had submitted a curriculum vitae CV for Helen

Harcus, who is the current programme leader. As this standard has been revised it now requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided, the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

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

Reason: In a review of the CLM minutes provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors read that “John Huckle retired in March; Sarah Sayer currently on sick leave; Jill Henderson retiring at the end of the year. John and Jill will not be replaced”. From this information, the visitors were unable to determine how the programme would continue to ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. In light of the changes to the programme leader and the dual role taken on by a current staff member, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how the gaps in the staffing would be filled to ensure there are enough resources on the programme, to allow an appropriate number of staff who are able and well equipped to deliver the programme effectively.

Suggested evidence: Information about there being an adequate number of staff who are appropriately qualified and experienced to deliver an effective programme.

Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Leeds
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol), FT (Full time)
Date submission received	28 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13883-V7G4D3

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 October 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 18
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07754

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has provided the curriculum vitae of an appropriate and experienced person who holds overall professional responsibility for this programme, However, this standard now requires the education provider to demonstrate there is a process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As the visitors could not see any evidence of what process is in place to identify a suitable person or a replacement for this post, they could not determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing the process in place to recruit a programme leader, such as recruitment processes, job descriptions and/or person specifications.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme remain approved

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Liverpool
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	31 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13824-F5Z4T5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Joanna Goodwin	Occupational therapist
Lisa Marks Woolfson	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 January 1998
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 54
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07762

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had appointed a qualified occupational therapist as the current programme leader. As this standard has been revised it now requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a

suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

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

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider had provided forms about how they would request information from service users and feedback about activities the service users were involved in. However, there were no details provided about how the service users were involved within the programme. For example, in the module specification it mentions different ways service users were involved in the programme for example “experiential practical group working with service users” and “expert service user involvement in learning and teaching”. As there were no details provided about what these activities would entail the visitors were unable to make a decision as to whether this standard continued to be met.

Suggested evidence: Information about how service users and carers are involved within this programme.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted for this standard, in evidence 9 which states “uni professional lecturers to convey core concepts of transition and interprofessional lecturers on shared topics of relevance to a variety of healthcare professionals”. The visitors were not satisfied that the education provider could ensure that all learners would be able to learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions because there were no details provided about what the interprofessional sessions would entail and how all learners would have access to these.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing how the education provider will ensure that all learners are able to learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Liverpool
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time
Date submission received	31 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13826-K3C6W2

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Joanne Lusher	Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist
Linda Mutema	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07764

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had submitted a curriculum vitae for Stuart

Mackay who is the current programme leader. As this standard has been revised it now requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Liverpool
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	31 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13827-J6Z5Z0

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Lorna Povey	Speech and language therapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 1998
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07766

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had provided us with the curricula vitae of Bridget Mary Porritt, head of radiotherapy, and Jenny Callender, director of studies. The visitors were made aware both are registered therapeutic radiographers. This standard requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional

responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Liverpool John Moores University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, FT (Full time) BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, PT (Part time)
Date submission received	28 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13928-L6M1W8

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation	5

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Mary Hannon-Fletcher	Biomedical scientist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07770

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07771

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had informed us the programme leaders are appropriately qualified and when there is a change in post-holder it is the responsibility of the appointment panel to ensure the criteria are met. This standard requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen in full the formal process to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had informed us all NHS trusts have a policy in place to cover wellbeing and whistle blowing and that this is covered during laboratory induction. The visitors saw the evidence the education provider provided related to practice-based learning. The visitors were not able to find information about how learners were able to raise concerns specifically when they believe the safety and wellbeing of service users is at risk on the whole of the programme. This standard requires the education provider has an effective process in place. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has when learners believe the safety and wellbeing of service users is at risk during the programme.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: In a review of the documentation for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors were made aware of plans the education provider have to ensure learners work together with other professionals and across professions. They have planned activities with pharmacy learners and activities with nursing department are being investigated, as well as seeking funding for a mini-conference across programmes and involve students and staff. However, the visitors were aware these were proposals at this stage. In addition to these plans, the visitors were informed the education provider ran a pilot group with pharmacy learners in 2016-17. As such, the visitors were not able to fully

determine whether and how learners currently engage with other professionals and across learners in other relevant professions.

Suggested evidence: Information to demonstrate how learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Middlesex University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, FT (Full time)
Date submission received	28 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13843-L4H4S7

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Joanna Goodwin	Occupational therapist
Pradeep Agrawal	Biomedical scientist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 8
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07796

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	No	This document was not provided for the academic year 2016-17
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes	
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted the education provider had provided the curriculum vitae of an appropriate and experienced person who holds

overall professional responsibility for this programme. However, this standard now requires the education provider to demonstrate there is a process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As the visitors could not see any evidence of what process is in place to identify a suitable person or a replacement for this post, they could not determine whether this standard is met. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the process to ensure there is an effective process in place to identify a suitable person with overall professional responsibility for the programme and if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing the process in place to recruit a person with overall professional responsibility for the programme, such as recruitment processes, job descriptions or person specifications.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Speech Pathology and Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	25 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13944-X2Y3J8

Contents

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

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Clare Attrill	Speech and language therapist
Gordon Burrow	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech Pathology and Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07799

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist

First intake	01 August 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08320

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	MSc (Pre-Registration) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	22 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13948-G2K6N7

Contents

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

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Lorna Povey	Speech and language therapist
Elspeth McCartney	Speech and language therapist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc (Pre-Registration) Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 14
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07807

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Psychology and Speech Pathology, Full time
Date submission received	19 December 2018
Case reference	CAS-14279-S8L9L0

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Calum Delaney	Speech and language therapist
Lucy Myers	Speech and language therapist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Psychology and Speech Pathology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 1996
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08317

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors were able to see from the evidence provided that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme was appropriate. However, this is a new standard, which requires education providers to demonstrate that they have some means of ensuring that, if a programme lead needs to be replaced, a suitable person will fill the role. It was not clear to the visitors that the education provider has a

process in place through which they can ensure this. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating that the standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing the process used to identify and appoint suitable individuals to have overall professional responsibility for the programme.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: The visitors viewed evidence relating to how learners are enabled to follow general safeguarding procedures. However, from their review it was not clear how learners are supported and enabled to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. In particular it was not clear how the education provider

- enables learners to recognise situations where service users might be at risk;
- ensures that learners understood their responsibilities regarding concerns;
- ensures that learners would not be penalised for raising concerns, and that learners understood this.

Suggested evidence: Evidence relating to how the education provider communicates to learners the procedures and expectations around raising concerns.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The visitors viewed evidence showing that there is some inter-professional education on the programme. However, it was not clear to them how this was planned and integrated within the programme as a whole. They were also not able, from the evidence provided, to determine whether all learners had the opportunity to learn with, and from, learners in other relevant professions, or how the education provider has made decisions about the design and delivery of IPE to ensure that the professions involved are the most relevant.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing

- how the education provider ensures that all learners are able to learn with, and from, learners and professionals in other relevant professions; and
- how the education provider has determined which professions are the most relevant.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Newcastle University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Language Pathology, Full time
Date submission received	06 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13954-K1Y3H3

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Lorna Povey	Speech and language therapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Language Pathology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 August 1991
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 18
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07813

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the education provider informed us Christos Salis is the Programme Director and had been in the post since September 2014. The visitors were made aware he is a qualified and registered speech and language therapist. This standard requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Newcastle University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Sciences, Full time
Date submission received	28 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13857-N5Q0X6

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Lorna Povey	Speech and language therapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Sciences
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 1996
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07814

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the education provider informed us Nicole Lallini is the Programme Director and had been in the post since September 2014. The visitors were made aware she is a qualified and registered speech and language therapist. This standard requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Nottingham
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology (D.App.Ed.Psy), Full time
Date submission received	04 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13956-V4D5Q4

Contents

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

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Andrew Richards	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology (D.App.Ed.Psy)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Educational psychologist
First intake	01 January 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07815

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Nottingham
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	01 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13961-P6C9K4

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Carol Rowe	Physiotherapist
Valerie Maehle	Physiotherapist
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1997
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07820

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In their submission, the education provider has provided the curriculum vitae of an allocated person with overall responsibility for the programme. However, this standard is about whether there is a process in place for appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person with overall responsibility to the programme. The visitors were unable to determine from the programme documentation if there is a clear procedure for appointing such a person.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates what the process is for appointing the person who holds overall professional responsibility for the programme.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The education provider had provided evidence of the criteria for assessing learners' performance after finishing their practice-based learning. The visitors noted that expectations of professional behaviour were threaded through the curriculum, and the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics were referred to throughout the programme content. However, the visitors were unable to see in any of the modules any reference to the requirement that learners should be able to demonstrate and meet all the expectations of professional behaviour before the module can be passed.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates how the assessments on the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are done for learners to meet the expectation of professional behaviour.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Part time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time
Date submission received	19 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13865-Z0F3F5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 28
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07826

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2013

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 28
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07829

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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

Reason: For this annual monitoring audit, the education provider is required to submit the external examiners' reports for the last two years. However, the visitors noted that the submission documentation contained duplicate evidence of the examiners' reports for the year 2017-18. Therefore the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider satisfies the standard. The visitors require further evidence to determine whether the programme has regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place and the standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: The external examiner report for the 2016 – 2017 academic year, or reasons as to why this could not be provided to demonstrate this standard continues to be met.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The education provider has mentioned in their submission that interprofessional learning (IPL) is implemented in their programme. However the visitors were unable to see evidence on how IPL is integrated in their programme and how it is structured. Therefore the visitors were unable to determine how learners are able to learn with, and from, practitioners and learners in other relevant professions. The visitors require further evidence to assess whether the standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence to demonstrate how the programme will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learning in other relevant professions.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Part time
Date submission received	01 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13870-S4K1T1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	5

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Dawn Blenkin	Occupational therapist
James McManus	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 1992
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 75
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07839

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 1992
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07840

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years.	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the visitors were provided with access a generic programme lead template that detailed requirements for programme leads across the education provider. While this detailed the requirements for academic experience that was satisfactory for the visitors, it was not specific about the registration status of the programme lead or alternate arrangements made for the occupational therapy programme. To meet the standard visitors would need to understand how the registration status of a programme lead will be ensured, should a new appointment be required.

Suggested evidence: Information that demonstrates how the education provider uses the standard university procedure within the context of professional requirements, to ensure the person holding overall professional responsibility for this specific programme is registered as appropriate.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provider highlighted how learners have been involved in the programme and showed how they have acted on learner feedback. However, the education provider has also indicated that learners are involved in a “specific (paid) role within some modules”. The visitors were not able to view the module outline U42507 document that highlighted this involvement. The visitors were satisfied that the education provider’s broad approach to involving learners was appropriate to meet this standard, but were unclear how this paid role contributes to this involvement. Therefore, they were unable to make a judgment on this element of learner involvement. Furthermore, the visitors would need to consider if these paid roles have an impact on any other standards, depending on how learners are being used, for example as service users and carers, or as hourly paid lecturers (as applicable). Therefore, the visitors require further information about how this paid role works, in order to make a judgement about whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Information about the paid roles, and their place within the specific modules to ensure learners are appropriately involved in the programme.

4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The education provider highlighted that the HCPC standards of conduct performance and ethics are encapsulated within learning outcomes of compulsory modules U42900, U42929 and U42973. However, the visitors were unable to access the module outlines for these modules and so were unable to confirm that learners have the opportunity to learn about professional conduct. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate that expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards

of conduct, performance and ethics, are covered in academic teaching to ensure safe and professional practice.

Suggested Evidence: Information that demonstrates how this standard is met, such as the module outlines and learning outcomes for the modules that cover teaching of professional behaviour including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	06 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13969-C3C7M6

Contents

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

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Jacqueline Waterfield	Physiotherapist
Robert Keeble	Biomedical scientist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2000
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 45
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07841

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Name of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice, Full time Dip HE Operating Department Practice, Part time
Date submission received	19 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13872-L0H1F6

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 41
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07842

Programme name	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2007

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 41
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07843

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: The education provider has provided no information on the status of the programme in regards to its closure. However, the visitors noted in the external examiners' report that the programme is no longer recruiting learners. The visitors were unable to determine whether the programme is running with any learners not yet graduated or the last cohort has graduated thus the programme is closed. The visitors are unclear on the status of the programme and require further evidence to enable them to make a judgement on this standard.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which clarifies the status of the programme. Depending on the status of the programme, the HCPC would expect to be informed on the status of the programme through a form which indicates further actions taken.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The education provider has mentioned in their submission that interprofessional learning (IPL) is implemented in their programme. However the visitors were unable to see evidence on how IPL is integrated in their programme and how it is structured. Therefore the visitors were unable to determine how learners are able to learn with, and from, practitioners and learners in other relevant professions. The visitors require further evidence to assess whether the standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence to demonstrate how the programme will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learning in other relevant professions.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Portsmouth
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, FT (Full time)
Date submission received	31 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13892-H8D8P3

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07852

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted the education provider had provided the curriculum vitae of an appropriate and experienced person who holds overall professional responsibility for this programme. However, this standard now requires the education provider to demonstrate there is a process in place to identify a

suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As the visitors could not see any evidence of what process is in place to identify a suitable person or a replacement for this post, they could not determine whether this standard is met. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the process to ensure there is an effective process in place to identify a suitable person with overall professional responsibility for the programme and if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing the process in place to recruit a person with overall professional responsibility for the programme, such as recruitment processes, job descriptions or person specifications.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Salford
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Part time
Date submission received	29 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13897-F8P3V7

Contents

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

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Andrew Hill	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Fleur Kitsell	Physiotherapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1999
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 53
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07861

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1999
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 34
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07862

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Salford
Name of programme(s)	Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 7), Flexible Non Medical Prescribing - Independent Prescribing, Flexible Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 6), Flexible
Date submission received	09 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13989-L5G0N6

Contents

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

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Alaster Rutherford	Independent prescriber
Matthew Catterall	Paramedic
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 7)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 February 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 18
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07864

Programme name	Non Medical Prescribing - Independent Prescribing
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)

Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07867

Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 6)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing
First intake	01 February 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 18
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07868

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our

standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Sheffield
Name of programme(s)	Doctor of Educational and Child Psychology (DEdCPsy), Full time
Date submission received	08 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13994-S5H7Z0

Contents

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

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Andrew Richards	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctor of Educational and Child Psychology (DEdCPsy)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Educational psychologist
First intake	01 January 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07881

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Southampton
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Part time
Date submission received	31 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13911-G7L3D1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	5

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Joanna Goodwin	Occupational therapist
Lisa Marks Woolfson	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 January 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07884

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Occupational therapist

First intake	01 September 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07885

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had provided a curriculum vitae for the current programme leader. As this standard has been revised it now requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

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

Reason: In a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that that there had been email communication between the education provider and a service user and carer to meet with the learners on the programme. However, the visitors were unaware how this had been developed further. The visitors also noted community projects that service users and carers would be involved in, however there were no details about what this would entail. Additionally, information was provided about a designated rep for service user and carer engagements. However, there were no further details about what this role would entail and how this would contribute to the programme. As there were no details about how service users and carers would be involved within this programme the visitors were unable to make a decision as to whether this standard continued to be met.

Suggested evidence: Information about how service users and carers are involved within the programme.

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

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the visitors were provided with a document providing an overview of the gaps within the module leadership for this programme. This document identified gaps within the teaching and areas which have been taken out of the programme. From this information, the visitors were unable to determine how the programme would continue to ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. As such, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how the gaps within the teaching are filled to ensure there are enough resources on the programme to allow an appropriate number of staff who are able and well equipped to deliver the programme effectively.

Suggested evidence: Information about there being an adequate number of staff who are appropriately qualified and experienced to deliver an effective programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Southampton
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsychol), FT (Full time)
Date submission received	06 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13996-F3G7N1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsychol)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07886

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has provided the curriculum vitae of an appropriate and experienced person who holds overall professional responsibility for this programme, However, this standard now requires the education provider to demonstrate there is a process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As the visitors could not see any evidence of what process is in place to identify a suitable person or a replacement for this post, they could not determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing the process in place to recruit a programme leader, such as recruitment processes, job descriptions and/or person specifications.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Southampton
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Part time
Date submission received	31 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13913-K9J7P1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Carol Rowe	Physiotherapist
Valerie Maehle	Physiotherapist
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07889

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1999

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07890

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In their submission, the education provider has provided the curriculum vitae of an allocated person with overall responsibility for the programme. However, this standard is about whether there is a process in place for appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person with overall responsibility to the programme. The visitors were unable to determine from the programme documentation if there is a clear procedure for appointing such a person.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates what the process is for appointing the person who holds overall professional responsibility for the programme.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: The education provider provided a placement monitoring document, minutes of practice learning committee and a fair shares allocation spreadsheet as evidence for this standard. The education provider has stated the “Fair share” allocation system as a way for identifying the practice-based learning opportunities for learners. From a review of their documentation, the visitors understood that the ‘fair shares’ allocation is undertaken annually where all local NHS providers are allocated a ‘fair share’ of students for the forthcoming year. However, as per the requirement for this standard, the visitors were unable to determine of the processes in place regarding how the education provider secures practice-based learning opportunities for learners currently on the programme and also what the planned provision for future learners is. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how the process in place for securing placements to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for learners is effective.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide further evidence, which demonstrates an effective process in place to make sure that all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning, which meets their learning needs.

Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Southampton
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	04 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13998-G1S4J5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Carol Rowe	Physiotherapist
Valerie Maehle	Physiotherapist
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07891

Programme name	Pg Dip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 October 2009

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07892

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and

experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In their submission, the education provider has provided the curriculum vitae of an allocated person with overall responsibility for the programme. However, this standard is about whether there is a process in place for appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person with overall responsibility to the programme. The visitors were unable to determine from the programme documentation if there is a clear procedure for appointing such a person.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates what the process is for appointing the person who holds overall professional responsibility for the programme.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: The education provider provided a placement monitoring document, minutes of practice learning committee and a fair shares allocation spreadsheet as evidence for this standard. The education provider has stated the “Fair share” allocation system as a way for identifying the practice-based learning opportunities for learners. From a review of their documentation, the visitors understood that the ‘fair shares’ allocation is undertaken annually where all local NHS providers are allocated a ‘fair share’ of students for the forthcoming year. However, as per the requirement for this standard, the visitors were unable to determine of the processes in place regarding how the education provider secures practice-based learning opportunities for learners currently on the programme and also what the planned provision for future learners is. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how the process in place for securing placements to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for learners is effective.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide further evidence, which demonstrates an effective process in place to make sure that all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning, which meets their learning needs.

Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Southampton
Name of programme(s)	Health Psychology Research and Professional Practice (PhD), Full time Health Psychology Research and Professional Practice (PhD), Part time
Date submission received	31 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13914-C1X1X5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Joanne Lusher	Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist
Linda Mutema	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Health Psychology Research and Professional Practice (PhD)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Health psychologist
First intake	01 January 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07893

Programme name	Health Psychology Research and Professional Practice (PhD)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Health psychologist
First intake	01 January 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07894

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In a review of this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the learners meet monthly with the programme director to provide feedback and share experiences of their progress, insights and any problems encountered on the programme. It was also noted that there was a representative invited to attend programme boards and Postgraduate Staff-Student Liaison Committees. However, as there was no evidence of the discussions within the meetings provided, the visitors were unable to determine how learners were involved within the programme. As such, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how learners contribute to the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating that learners are involved in the programme.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider explained that there are safeguarding policies in place to use in the practice-based setting. The visitors could not find information on what the process is to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users and carers. As such, the visitors could not determine whether there is an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate what the process is for supporting and enabling learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, and how the learners have access to this information should they need to refer to it.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, and how learners have access to this information.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Southampton
Name of programme(s)	Health Psychology Research and Professional Practice (MPhil), Full time Health Psychology Research and Professional Practice (MPhil), Part time
Date submission received	01 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13916-T5C0G5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Joanne Lusher	Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist
Linda Mutema	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Health Psychology Research and Professional Practice (MPhil)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Health psychologist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07898

Programme name	Health Psychology Research and Professional Practice (MPhil)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Health psychologist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07899

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In a review of this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the learners meet monthly with the programme director to provide feedback and share experiences of their progress, insights and any problems encountered on the programme. It was also noted that there was a representative invited to attend programme boards and Postgraduate Staff-Student Liaison Committees. However, as there was no evidence of the discussions within the meetings provided, the visitors were unable to determine how learners were involved within the programme. As such, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how learners contribute to the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating that learners are involved in the programme.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider explained that there are safeguarding policies in place to use in the practice-based setting. The visitors could not find information on what the process is to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users and carers. As such, the visitors could not determine whether there is an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate what the process is for supporting and enabling learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, and how the learners have access to this information should they need to refer to it.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, and how learners have access to this information.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Staffordshire University
Name of programme(s)	Independent/Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals (Level 6), Part time Independent/Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals (Level 7), Part time
Date submission received	29 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13918-S2V9K6

Contents

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

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Alaster Rutherford	Independent prescriber
Matthew Catterall	Paramedic
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Independent/Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals (Level 6)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 February 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	AM07903

Programme name	Independent/Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals (Level 7)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 February 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	AM07910

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Staffordshire University
Name of programme(s)	Professional Doctorate in Clinical Psychology, FT (Full time)
Date submission received	15 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-14003-V1K3Z0

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Clinical Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
First intake	01 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07904

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors reviewed the supervisor handbook and other documentations as well. From a review of the documentation, the visitors were unable to see any evidence which demonstrates the process of raising concerns in the practice-based learning nor any policy and procedure of how learners can raise concerns about the safety of service users and carers. Therefore the visitors could not determine whether the standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence regarding the process for learners to raise concerns during practice based learning.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#)

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Keele University and Staffordshire University
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy), FT (Full time)
Date submission received	04 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-14004-S1Z3X7

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07911

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has provided the curriculum vitae of an appropriate and experienced person who holds overall professional responsibility for this programme, However, this standard now requires the education

provider to demonstrate there is a process in place to identify a suitable person if it becomes necessary. As the visitors could not see any evidence of what process is in place to identify a suitable person or a replacement for this post, they could not determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing the process in place to recruit a programme leader, such as recruitment processes, job descriptions and/or person specifications.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the supervisor handbook. From a review of the documentation, the visitors were unable to see any evidence which demonstrates the process of raising concerns in the practice-based learning or any policy and procedure of how learners can raise concerns about the safety of service users and carers. Therefore, the visitors could not determine whether the standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence regarding the process for learners to raise concerns during practice based learning.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme remain approved

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Sunderland
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, Full time
Date submission received	27 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13920-Y5C1H6

Contents

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

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Jacqueline Waterfield	Physiotherapist
Robert Keeble	Biomedical scientist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07912

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Sunderland
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science), Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cellular Science), Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science), Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science), Full time
Date submission received	28 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-14005-V7G4M7

Contents

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

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Jacqueline Waterfield	Physiotherapist
Robert Keeble	Biomedical scientist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07913

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cellular Science)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist

First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07914

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07915

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07916

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes

Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes
--	-----

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Surrey
Validating body	University of Surrey
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (PsychD), FT (Full time)
Date submission received	07 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-14006-D3V5P1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Kathryn Burgess	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (PsychD)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 1995
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 32
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07918

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	No	It was stated that this has been provided for the last 2 years, but visitors could not locate this document
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes	
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors determined that the education provider has provided the curriculum vitae of an appropriate and experienced person who holds overall professional responsibility for this programme. However, this standard now requires the education provider to demonstrate there is a process in place to identify a suitable person if it becomes necessary. As the visitors could not see any evidence of what process is in place to identify a suitable person or a replacement for this post, they could not determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing the process in place to recruit a programme leader, such as recruitment processes, job descriptions or person specifications.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider has provided no relevant evidence as per the SETs mapping document. From reviewing the documentary submission in one of the meeting minutes provided, the visitors noted that learners from year one sit and learn with other learners on the Improved Access for Psychological Therapies (IAPT). However, it was not clear as to how learners learn from other professions and what arrangements are in place for learners in subsequent years. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine if this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Relevant information or document suggesting how inter profession learning will be carried out for learners across all years for this programme. The evidence must demonstrate how learners will be able to learn with and from other professions

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#)

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Surrey
Name of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice, Full time
Date submission received	05 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-14015-Q9C2P7

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07922

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	University of Surrey does not write EE responses if questions are answered satisfactorily on the day of the exam board
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes	
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provided has provided information which shows that learners are invited to quarterly meetings and student staff liaison committees. The visitors noted that there are areas in the submission documentation where learners are referenced. However, from the information provided in the submission documentation the visitors were unclear how learners are involved in the programme or what the plan is for them to be engaged in the programme. The visitors were unable to determine how learners are involved in the programme.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence on how learners are involved in the programme.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The education provider has mentioned in their submission that interprofessional learning (IPL) is implemented in their programme. The visitors noted the NUR1023 module which aims to introduce learners to the philosophy of health care science. However the visitors were unable to understand how IPL is integrated in their programme and how it is structured. Therefore the visitors were unable to determine how learners are able to learn with, and from, practitioners and learners in other relevant professions. The visitors require further evidence to assess whether the standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence on the module plan, with any potential supporting documentation on timetabling how IPL is integrated in their programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Surrey
Name of programme(s)	PhD in Health Psychology with Stage 2 Training, Full time PhD in Health Psychology with Stage 2 Training, Part time
Date submission received	30 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13924-F0L4V3

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Joanne Lusher	Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist
Linda Mutema	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PhD in Health Psychology with Stage 2 Training
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Health psychologist
First intake	01 October 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07923

Programme name	PhD in Health Psychology with Stage 2 Training
Mode of study	PT (Part time)

Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Health psychologist
First intake	01 October 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07924

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had submitted a curriculum vitae for Bridget Dibb who is the current programme leader. As this standard has been revised it now requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Swansea University
Name of programme(s)	PGCert Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals, Part time PGCert Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals, Part time
Date submission received	01 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-14009-Q7M2V2

Contents

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

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Alaster Rutherford	Independent prescriber
Matthew Catterall	Paramedic
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PGCert Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing
First intake	01 August 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	4
Assessment reference	AM07925

Programme name	PGCert Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary Prescribing Independent Prescribing
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	AM07927

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University College London
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsych), Full time
Date submission received	08 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-14012-C1T9Q0

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	5

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Lincoln Simmonds	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Antony Ward	Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsych)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 1995
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 42
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07934

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors were able to see a curriculum vitae for one of the current Joint Course Directors (JCDs) and the mapping document informed them that both of the JCDs were registered with the HCPC. The visitors were satisfied that the overall supervision of the programme was appropriate. However the education provider did not appear to have submitted further evidence relating to the process for appointing a new programme leader and so the visitors were unable to determine whether the process was effective and appropriate.

Suggested evidence: Evidence relating to the process by which the education provider ensures that, in the event that a new programme leader has to be appointed, that person is appropriately experienced and qualified.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: In their mapping document attached to the audit form, the education provider stated that no changes had been made in this area and they did not provide any supporting evidence in their submission. However, as this is a new standard, the HCPC expects education providers to submit evidence showing how they have met it and the visitors were unable to determine whether this standard had been met. This applies whether or not they have made any changes to the programme to meet the standard.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing that there is an effective process in place for learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: In their mapping document attached to the audit form, the education provider stated that no changes had been made in this area and they did not provide any supporting evidence in their submission. However, as this is a new standard, the HCPC expects education providers to submit evidence showing how they have met it and the visitors were unable to determine whether this standard had been met. This applies whether or not they have made any changes to the programme to meet the standard.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing that there is an effective process in place for learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: In their evidence, the education provider referred the visitors to the Mid Placement Review and End of Placement Review used on the programme. The visitors noted that while these documents did give practice-based learning supervisors the opportunity to comment on learners' understanding of personal and professional skills, it was not clear that satisfactory demonstration of such skills was required to pass the placements. The visitors also noted that the documents made no direct references to the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics, and that the education provider had not provided evidence of how assessment in the academic parts of the programme ensured that learners demonstrated they were able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour. They were therefore unable to determine that the standard was met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing that learners are required to demonstrate professional behaviour in order to pass practice-based learning, and that assessment in the academic components of the programme ensures learners meet expectations of professional behaviour.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of East London
Name of programme(s)	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology, Full time
Date submission received	09 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-14036-B4F2X2

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Antony Ward	Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist
Lincoln Simmonds	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 26
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07953

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: As their evidence for this standard, the education provider submitted a job description for the Programme Director. The visitors considered that this job description was appropriate for the role; however the education provider did not submit evidence relating to the process by which a new programme director would be appointed if necessary. The job description was thorough but on its own did not enable the visitors to be certain that an appropriate process was in place. The job description also mentioned that it was subject to change by the education provider. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating that an effective process is in place for appointing a new Programme Director.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of East London
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time
Date submission received	07 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13955-C2J4V6

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Pradeep Agarwal	Biomedical scientist
Gordon Burrow	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07954

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted the evidence provided explained that the individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme is registered with the HCPC. As per the requirement for this revised standard, the visitors could not see any evidence of what process is in place to identify a suitable person to lead the programme and if it

becomes necessary a replacement for this post. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the process to ensure there is an effective process in place to identify a suitable person with overall professional responsibility for the programme and if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

Suggested evidence: The process in place to recruit a programme leader, such as recruitment processes, job descriptions or person specifications.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#)

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of East London
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, - (Full time)
Date submission received	07 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-14037-T7L2X5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Carol Rowe	Physiotherapist
Valerie Maehle	Physiotherapist
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 110
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07955

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In their submission, the education provider has provided the curriculum vitae of an allocated person with overall responsibility for the programme. However, this revised standard is about whether there is a process in place for appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person with overall responsibility to the

programme. The visitors were unable to determine from the programme documentation that there is a clear procedure for appointing such a person.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates what the process is for appointing the person who holds overall professional responsibility for the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science), FT (Full time) BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science), PT (Part time) BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science), FT (Full time) BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science), PT (Part time) BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science), FT (Full time) BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science), PT (Part time) BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Tissue Science), FT (Full time) BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Tissue Science), PT (Part time) BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Transfusion and Transplantation Science), FT (Full time)
Date submission received	08 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13957-K1W9Y8

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	4
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	5
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	6

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the

process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Joanna Goodwin	Occupational therapist
Pradeep Agrawal	Biomedical scientist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 27
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07956

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 27
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07958

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 27
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07959

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Science)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 27
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07960

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 27
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07961

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 27
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07962

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Tissue Science)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 27
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07963

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Tissue Science)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 27
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07964

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Transfusion and Transplantation Science)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07978

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	

Internal quality reports from the last two years	No	This was not provided as part of the annual monitoring audit. The education provider has mentioned that this will be provided "as soon as possible"
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes	
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors determined that the education provider has mentioned that the curriculum vitae of Dr Trevor Whittall was approved by HCPC as part of a major change process to be an appropriate person holding overall responsibility for the programme. However, this standard now requires the education provider to demonstrate there is a process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement unless other arrangements are appropriate. As the visitors could not see any evidence of what process is in place to identify a suitable person or a replacement for this post should this be necessary, they could not determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing the process in place to recruit a programme leader, such as recruitment processes or arrangements in place

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

Reason: As per the requirement for annual monitoring audits, the internal quality reports have not been provided for the last two academic years for this programme. The

education provider has stated in the annual monitoring audit form that this will be provided “as soon as possible”. Without this evidence, the visitors were unable to determine if this standard has been met. Therefore, they require evidence showing the programmes have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place to be able to make a judgement regarding this standard.

Suggested evidence: Internal quality monitoring documents for the last 2 academic years or relevant documents to address this standard.

4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: For this evidence, the visitors were directed to the programme specification, professional practice handbook and placement handbook. From reviewing the documentation, the visitors were unable to see evidence of any reference to the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPE’s) in the documentation. They could not see evidence within the documentation about how learners are expected to understand and be able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Therefore, the visitors require further information, which demonstrates the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are delivered within this programme, in order to make a judgement about whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Relevant documentation incorporating the learning outcomes to ensure learners are able to understand and are able to meet the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programmes remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#)

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Full time
Date submission received	12 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-14038-Q5Z6Q9

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Lorna Povey	Speech and language therapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07957

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the education provider informed us learners are involved in the programme in several ways. The visitors were made aware learners are involved in a forum, a system of representation, committees, peer assisted learning and learner inductions. The visitors were able to find only one of the sources of evidence which the education provider referenced in the mapping document, namely the practice educators' day agenda and minutes. The visitors were therefore unable to determine how learners contribute to the quality, effectiveness and continuous improvement of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Information to show how learners contribute to the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Name of programme(s)	Post Graduate Diploma in Health Psychology (Professional Practice), Part time
Date submission received	05 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13958-P4B6G5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Joanne Lusher	Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist
Linda Mutema	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Health Psychology (Professional Practice)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Health psychologist
First intake	01 January 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07965

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider explained that there are a set of guidelines in the programme handbook for learners to raise concerns about the programme. The visitors could not find information on what the process is to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users

and carers. As such, the visitors could not determine whether there is an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate what the process is for supporting and enabling learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, and how the learners have access to this information should they need to refer to it.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, and how learners have access to this information.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Name of programme(s)	Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology, Part time
Date submission received	06 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-14042-N7R3B9

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Joanne Lusher	Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist
Linda Mutema	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Health psychologist
First intake	01 January 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07974

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had not provided any evidence for how this

standard is met. As this standard has been revised it now requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Name of programme(s)	MSc Radiotherapy & Oncology, Full time
Date submission received	12 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-14043-T3W2V1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Lorna Povey	Speech and language therapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Radiotherapy & Oncology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 February 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07977

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the education provider informed us learners are involved in the programme in several ways. The visitors were made aware learners are involved in a forum, a system of representation, committees, peer assisted learning and learner inductions. The visitors were unable to find the sources of evidence the education provider referenced in the mapping document. The visitors were therefore unable to determine how learners contribute to the quality, effectiveness and continuous improvement of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Information to show how learners contribute to the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 April 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).