

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Birmingham City University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social workers in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social worker in England) Patricia Higham (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social workers - England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social worker in England) Patricia Higham (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Index of evidence for HCPC Audit
 - University of Brighton approved social work courses
 - 2016-17 Student Contract Complaints Resolution
 - Academic Health process and timescales
 - Equality and Diversity Policy 2016
 - GEAR Section H 16-17
 - GEAR Section I 16-17

- SDR Guidelines Academic Staff
- BScSW Course Handbook 2016-17
- Role plays student consent 2015
- BSc1 Law for Social Work Hbk 2106 FINAL
- SS601 contemporary
- Q Social Work Management Meeting Minutes
- Qualifying SW Man Gp Minutes
- Notes from Service user and carer group
- Emails to service users and carers

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that there is one set of notes from the service user and carer group meeting however the meeting happens three times per year. The visitors suggest that the education provider submit all the notes or minutes from these meetings in future submissions. Within the minutes it is stated that service users and carers are involved in the programme in a variety of ways including teaching, assessing and interviewing. However, the visitors would like to advise the education provider submits as much documentation as possible regarding the involvement of service users and carers, such as details of how their involvement is appropriate for this programme, how service users are supported to fulfil their role and evidence of attendance at the relevant meetings.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	Msc Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social workers in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce ((Social worker in England) Patricia Higham (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasyelc
Date of assessment day	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
 - Internal quality report for one year ago
 - Internal quality report for two years ago
 - External examiner's report for one year ago
 - External examiner's report for two years ago
 - Response to external examiner's report one year ago
 - Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- Index of evidence for HCPC Audit
 - University of Brighton approved social work courses
 - 2016-17 Student Contract Complaints Resolution
 - Academic Health process and timescales
 - Equality and Diversity Policy 2016
 - GEAR Section H 16-17
 - GEAR Section I 16-17
 - SDR Guidelines Academic Staff

- MScSW Course Handbook 2016-17
- Role plays student consent 2015
- SS786 – Legal policy Context of Decision Making in Social Work
- SS790 Contemporary Social Work
- Q Social Work Management Meeting Minutes
- Qualifying SW Man Gp Minutes
- Notes from Service user and carer group
- Emails to service users and carers

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that there is one set of notes from the service user and carer group meeting however the meeting happens three times per year. The visitors suggest that the education provider submit all the notes or minutes from these meetings in future submissions. Within the minutes it is stated that service users and carers are involved in the programme in a variety of ways including teaching, assessing and interviewing. However, the visitors would like to advise the education provider submits as much documentation as possible regarding the involvement of service users and carers, such as details of how their involvement is appropriate for this programme, how service users are supported to fulfil their role and evidence of attendance at the relevant meetings

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma Approved Mental Health Practice
Mode of delivery	Part time
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Shelia Skelton (Social worker in England/ Approved mental health professional) John Donaghy (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- PG Diploma AMHP
- Applicant Information Leaflet
- PG Diploma AMHP Course Handbook
- University of Brighton's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy
- University of Brighton's Academic Health process 2015-16
- University of Brighton's Staff Development Review – Guidance Notes for Academic Staff

- University of Brighton Student Complaints Procedure – Student Complaints Resolution Procedure
- Managing Mental Health Act Assessments and Interventions module handbook 2015-16
- University of Brighton General Examination and Assessment Regulations, Section H: Academic Appeals
- University of Brighton General Examination and Assessment Regulations, Section I, External Examiners

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	PG Cert Mental Health Practice including Approved Mental Health Professional training (AMHP)
Mode of delivery	Work-based learning
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Shelia Skelton (Social worker in England/ Approved mental health professional) John Donaghy (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	Advanced Certificate Non Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicola Carey (Independent prescriber) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	13 December 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

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

- User/Carer Perspective Template
- Module Descriptor Level 6 NU3023
- Module Descriptor Level 7 NU4023
- Module Handbook Level 6 NU3023
- Module Handbook Level 7 NU4023

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided the visitors are unclear as to whether service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors were able to see that individual students are expected to interact and respond to the needs of individual service users in their placement training. However, no evidence was submitted which showed how service users were involved in the programme overall, what their involvement and contributions are and how they are appropriately trained. As such the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors also require further evidence as to how the programme team train and prepare the service users and carers to ensure that they can fulfil any role they are being asked to undertake.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how service users and carers form part of the programme, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare the service users and carers to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake where applicable.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	Advanced Certificate Non Medical Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Independent prescribing Supplementary prescribing
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Nicola Carey (Independent prescriber) Alaster Rutherford (Independent prescriber)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	13 December 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
 - Internal quality report for one year ago
 - Internal quality report for two years ago
 - External examiner's report for one year ago
 - External examiner's report for two years ago
 - Response to external examiner's report one year ago
 - Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- User/Carer Perspective Template
 - Module Descriptor Level 6 NU3023
 - Module Descriptor Level 7 NU4023
 - Module Handbook Level 6 NU3023
 - Module Handbook Level 7 NU4023

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards for prescribing for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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

Reason: From a review of the evidence provided the visitors are unclear as to whether service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors were able to see that individual students are expected to interact and respond to the needs of individual service users in their placement training. However, no evidence was submitted which showed how service users were involved in the programme overall, what their involvement and contributions are and how they are appropriately trained. As such the visitors require further evidence of the process the programme team use to determine how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors also require further evidence as to how the programme team train and prepare the service users and carers to ensure that they can fulfil any role they are being asked to undertake.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence as to how service users and carers form part of the programme, how their involvement is determined and how the team prepare the service users and carers to ensure they can fulfil the roles they are being asked to undertake where applicable.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards for prescribing for education providers and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers.

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	25 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted in the 2015-2016 internal quality report that the education provider will be making changes to their admissions procedures for the 2016-2017 academic year. The education provider will now be introducing a group activity alongside the individual interview. The education provider will need to inform the HCPC through a major change notification form if this will affect our standards about the admissions procedures.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	25 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted in the 2015-2016 internal quality report that the education provider will be making changes to their admissions procedures for the 2016-2017 academic year. The education provider will now be introducing a group activity alongside the individual interview. The education provider will need to inform the HCPC through a major change notification form if this will affect our standards about the admissions procedures.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme title	BA Honours in Applied Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	25 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Standards of proficiency mapping
 - Example of internal moderation documents
 - Module handbooks
 - Practice educator feedback reports
 - Practice learning curriculum report
 - Student feedback reports for placement
 - Programme specification

- Staff curriculum vitae

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Richard Barker (Social worker in England) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	8 December 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - SETs mapping
 - SOPs mapping
 - MA interviews social work recruitment handbook
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Programme specification
 - Grading documentation
 - Programme handbooks

The programme has only been running for one academic year (2015-16) since approved by HCPC so there is only one year of monitoring documentation to review.

Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the statement on page 7 of the programme handbook that the successful completion of the programme provides eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. However, on page 6 of the handbook for the recruitment and selection of students - a document available to potential applicants - the visitors noted the following statement: "The MA Social Work offers the legally protected title of Social Worker." Students who successfully complete the programme are only eligible to apply to register with the HCPC – registration is not guaranteed on completion of the programme. Therefore, the visitors note that this statement is misleading to potential applicants. As such, the visitors require further evidence that the programme documentation has been updated to ensure the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC and so that students can make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation accurately reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC in information available for applicants.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: The visitors noted from the annual monitoring submission that the education provider has introduced a new module entitled The Independent Study 7SW999 module. The visitors noted from the module descriptor, that students will be collecting primary data and that they discuss any potential ethical issues with their individual supervisors. However, the visitors were unclear from the documentation, how any issues that arise, particularly ethical issues, would be consistently and effectively managed. As such, the visitors require further evidence of processes in place to ensure that any issues are dealt with to demonstrate that the programme continues to be effectively managed.

Suggested documentation: Further information regarding processes in place to deal with any issues that may arise in the collection of primary data for the new module.

6.3 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting.

Reason: The visitors noted from the annual monitoring submission that the education provider has introduced a new module entitled The Independent Study 7SW999 module. The visitors noted from the module descriptor, that students will be collecting primary data and that they discuss any potential ethical issues with their individual supervisors. However, the visitors were unclear about how the programme team ensures that professional aspects of practice are integral to the assessment procedures in the collection of primary data, particularly with regard to values and ethics, in this new module.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate that professional aspects of practice are integral to the assessment procedures in the collection of primary data, particularly with regard to values and ethics, for the dissertation in this new module.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted from the annual monitoring submission that the education provider submitted documentation for an approval visit alongside the documentation for the annual monitoring audit. The visitors wish to remind the education provider that, in the future, only changes to the programme should be mapped using the annual monitoring mapping document and only evidence provided to support these changes should be submitted. In addition, web links should not be provided in the mapping document as the visitors receive hard copies of the documents at the annual monitoring day.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Derby,
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Radiographer
Relevant modality	Diagnostic radiographer
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	25 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Action plan
 - Programme handbook
 - Interview schedule
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Simulation consent form
 - Selection day presentation
 - Welcome pack
 - Expert by experience group minutes

- Inter-professional learning conference poster
- Admissions care and compassion workstation example
- Placement rotation
- Placement evaluation example
- List of trained supervisors
- Developing professional practice operating handbook
- Placement audit example

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme title	MA Dramatherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Dramtherapist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Tina Pyman(Dramatherapist) Antony Ward (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	27 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago#
 - Programme lead curriculum vitae
 - Disclosure and Barring Service information
 - Studio 4 Timetable (drama)
 - Attendance monitoring
 - Module specifications
 - Service user involvement evidence
 - Experts by Experience Meeting Minutes
 - Clinical Placement Two Handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	East London Mental Health Training Partnership
Name of validating body	Middlesex University
Programme title	Approved Mental Health Practitioner
Mode of delivery	Work-based learning
Programme type	Approved mental health professional
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Shelia Skelton (Social worker in England/ Approved mental health professional) John Donaghy (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Course Co-ordinators report 2014-15
 - Course Co-ordinators report 2015-16
 - Management meeting minutes 20.7.15
 - Management meeting minutes 7.12.15
 - Management meeting minutes 13.5.16
 - Course collaboration meeting minutes 8.3.16

- Assessment Board minutes 13.3.15
- Assessment board minutes 4.4.16
- Letter to Appeals Board 8.9.15
- Course handbook (separate document)

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the criteria for approved mental health professionals.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the approval criteria for approved mental health professional programmes listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors noted that in the external examiner reports and the assessment board results that student names are clearly seen. The visitors would like to advise the education provider that in order to protect student confidentiality and data protection that the names are redacted from documents provided for annual monitoring audits in the future.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Greenwich
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	25 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Definitive document
 - Programme handbook
 - Practice learning handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Greenwich
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	John Donaghy (Paramedic) Shelia Skelton (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day review	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Programme handbook
 - Programme specifications
 - Module descriptors

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Greenwich
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (London)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Paramedic
Name and role of HCPC visitors	John Donaghy (Paramedic) Shelia Skelton (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day review	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Programme handbook
 - Programme specification
 - Module descriptors

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Greenwich
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	25 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Definitive document
 - Programme handbook
 - Practice learning handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Greenwich
Programme title	PG Dip Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Graeme Currie (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah
Date of assessment day	25 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Definitive document
 - Programme handbook
 - Practice learning handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Kings College London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Fiona McCullough (Dietitian) Tracy Clephan (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date postal review	13 December 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
 - Internal quality report for one year ago
 - Internal quality report for two years ago
 - External examiner's report for one year ago
 - External examiner's report for two years ago
 - Response to external examiner's report one year ago
 - Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- British Dietetic Association accreditation 2016
 - Health Education England report
 - Staff curriculum vitae
 - Recruitment process for programme
 - Overview of service user involvement for the programme
 - Module descriptor handbook
 - Dietetic stakeholder involvement minutes
 - Public health placement provider forum agenda

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	King's College London
Programme title	MSc Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Fiona McCullough (Dietitian) Tracy Clephan (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date postal review	16 December 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Module handbooks
 - Practice placement meeting MSc Dietetics stakeholder meetings
 - Public Health Placement Provider Forum agenda July 2016
 - Overview of service user involvement in Dietetic programmes
 - Curriculum vitae for new staff members
 - Overview of recruitment processes for Dietetic programmes, 2016 entry
 - British Dietetic Association Accreditation 2016
 - Health Education England Annual Report KCL

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	King's College London
Programme title	Pg Dip Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Dietitian
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Fiona McCullough (Dietitian) Tracy Clephan (Dietitian)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date postal review	16 December 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Module handbooks
 - Practice placement meeting MSc Dietetics stakeholder meetings
 - Public Health Placement Provider Forum agenda July 2016
 - Overview of service user involvement in Dietetic programmes
 - Curriculum vitae for new staff members
 - Overview of recruitment processes for Dietetic programmes, 2016 entry
 - British Dietetic Association Accreditation 2016
 - Health Education England Annual Report KCL

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Lancaster
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Shelia Skelton (Social worker in England) John Donaghy (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day review	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Service User and Carer Involvement Report Update (2016)
 - Social Work Degree – Education Support Grant Financial Certificate (ESG05)
 - Fitness to Practice Process
 - Recruitment
 - Recruitment day programme (sample)
 - Joint statement of expectations for group task for facilitators
 - Outcome form – Group facilitators
 - Do's and Don'ts list for facilitators

- Stakeholder Admissions Meeting July 2016
- Follow up from recent recruitment day (email) July 2016
- Service User Feedback for Social Work Students (Placement form)
- Practice Assessment Panel (PAP)

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Leeds
Programme title	BA Honours in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Goemans (Social worker in England) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Leeds
Programme title	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Goemans (Social worker in England) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - MA/PG Dip Handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Leeds
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Goemans (Social worker in England) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - MA PG Dip Handbook

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Lincoln
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social workers in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social worker in England) Patricia Higham (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- Programme enhancement plan
- SUCP handbook
- Cover letter to HCPC
- BSc (Hons) SW Programme Specification

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Lincoln
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Social Work (Lincoln Campus)
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social workers in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social worker in England) Patricia Higham (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Programme enhancement plan
 - Handbook for service user/patient and carer involvement.
 - Cover letter to HCPC
 - BSc (Hons) SW Programme Specification

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Liverpool John Moores University
Programme title	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Goemans (Social worker in England) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Liverpool John Moores University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Goemans (Social worker in England) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- Examples of unit handbooks outlining Service User (SU) involvement
- Community Partnerships, MMU commitment to involving SU's/total respect
- Sample staff profile outlining shared opportunities with SU's
- Specific examples of co-production with Service Users and Carers including admissions timetable, written presentation sheet showing who was involved, induction timetable showing who was involved

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors are happy with the evidence provided and are content to reconfirm approval. However they noted in the two external examiners reports the external examiner had raised the fact that the students had reported that the staffing and resources for the number of students on the programme was not always sufficient for the number of students on the programme. The visitors noted that the education provider has detailed a response to handle the situation, however the visitors advise the education provider that should there be a further issue with cohort size for the programme they advise the HCPC by engaging with the major change process.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Goemans (Social worker in England) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Examples of unit handbooks outlining Service User (SU) involvement
 - Community Partnerships, MMU commitment to involving SU's/total respect
 - Sample staff profile outlining shared opportunities with SU's
 - Specific examples of co-production with Service Users and Carers ie admissions timetable, written presentation sheet showing who was involved, induction timetable showing who was involved etc.

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	PG Dip Social Work (Employment based)
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Goemans (Social worker in England) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Goemans (Social worker in England) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day	25 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	MSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Physiotherapist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Blood Sciences)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Staff CVs (appendices 1 and 3)
 - Correspondence regarding attempts to involve service users (appendix 2)

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors saw sufficient evidence that the education provider met SET 3.17 (Service users and carers must be involved in the programme), noting that there was sufficient, although limited service user and carer involvement in the programme. The education provider has provided evidence that they are attempting to extend such involvement, inviting patient representatives and employers to programme meetings and asking them for input on the admissions process.

The visitors advise that, during the programme's next annual monitoring or approval process, the education provider should demonstrate further progress in involving service users and carers in the programme when they flag changes to the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Cellular Sciences)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Staff CVs (appendices 1 and 3)
 - Correspondence regarding attempts to involve service users (appendix 2)

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors saw sufficient evidence that the education provider met SET 3.17 (Service users and carers must be involved in the programme), noting that there was sufficient, although limited service user and carer involvement in the programme. The education provider has provided evidence that they are attempting to extend such involvement, inviting patient representatives and employers to programme meetings and asking them for input on the admissions process.

The visitors advise that, during the programme's next annual monitoring or approval process, the education provider should demonstrate further progress in involving service users and carers in the programme when they flag changes to the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Genetic Sciences)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Staff CVs (appendices 1 and 3)
 - Correspondence regarding attempts to involve service users (appendix 2)

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors saw sufficient evidence that the education provider met SET 3.17 (Service users and carers must be involved in the programme), noting that there was sufficient, although limited service user and carer involvement in the programme. The education provider has provided evidence that they are attempting to extend such involvement, inviting patient representatives and employers to programme meetings and asking them for input on the admissions process.

The visitors advise that, during the programme's next annual monitoring or approval process, the education provider should demonstrate further progress in involving service users and carers in the programme when they flag changes to the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Sciences - Life Sciences (Infection Sciences)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Biomedical scientist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Campbell (Physiotherapist) David Houlston (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Staff CVs (appendices 1 and 3)
 - Correspondence regarding attempts to involve service users (appendix 2)

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Section five: Visitors' comments

The visitors saw sufficient evidence that the education provider met SET 3.17 (Service users and carers must be involved in the programme), noting that there was sufficient, although limited service user and carer involvement in the programme. The education provider has provided evidence that they are attempting to extend such involvement, inviting patient representatives and employers to programme meetings and asking them for input on the admissions process.

The visitors advise that, during the programme's next annual monitoring or approval process, the education provider should demonstrate further progress in involving service users and carers in the programme when they flag changes to the programme.

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	New College Durham
Name validating body	Teesside University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social worker in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Shelia Skelton (Social worker in England) John Donaghy (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day review	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Course handbook,
 - Placement handbook
 - Association of colleges article
 - Module guidance
 - Mental health information
 - Fitness to practice regulations
 - Admission information

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Forensic Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Forensic psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jacqueline Bates-Gaston (Forensic psychologist) George Delafield (Forensic psychologist)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of postal review	12 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Additional internal quality documentation
 - Assignment handbook for first year of the MSc
 - Minutes of course board meetings
 - Course Handbook
 - Minutes of exam board meetings
 - Applicants' interview guidance

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
Programme title	Top up Professional Doctorate in Forensic Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Forensic psychologist
Name and profession of HCPC visitors	Jacqueline Bates-Gaston (Forensic psychologist) George Delafield (Forensic psychologist)
HCPC executive	Niall Gooch
Date of assessment day / postal review	8 December 2016

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
- Additional internal quality documentation
- Assignment handbook for first year of the MSc
- Minutes of course board meetings
- Course Handbook

- Minutes of exam board meetings
- Applicants' interview guidance

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Staffordshire University
Programme title	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Social workers in England
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social worker in England) Patricia Higham (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive	Tamara Wasylec
Date of assessment day	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

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

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University College London
Programme title	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsych)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Clinical psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) Richard Kwiatkowski (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive	Jamie Hunt
Date of assessment day	18 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Programme business plan
 - British Psychological Society (BPS) report
 - Pan-London Quality & Regulation Unit Annual Report 2015 and 2016
 - Screenshot Moodle front page
 - Extracts from the course handbook regarding Appeals and complaints procedure and service user involvement in the programme
 - Health Psychology Unit 2016
 - Inter-Professional Learning documentation

- Example Exam Paper

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of East London
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Prescription only medicines – administration Prescription only medicines – sale / supply
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Social worker in England) Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive	Rebecca Stent
Date of assessment day	25 January 2017

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to external examiner's report one year ago
- Response to external examiner's report for two years ago
 - Module guide
 - Reflections on interviews by a service user

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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