

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | Birmingham City University   |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy, Full time<br>BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy, Part time |
| Date submission received | 01 April 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13733-P5W3Z5   |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Angela Duxbury   | Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer |
| Janet Lawrence   | Physiotherapist                         |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive                          |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy  |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)           |
| Profession             | Radiographer             |
| Modality               | Therapeutic radiographer |
| First intake           | 01 January 2003          |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 16                 |
| Intakes per year       | 1                        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07589                  |

|                |                         |
|----------------|-------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy |
| Mode of study  | PT (Part time)          |
| Profession     | Radiographer            |

|                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Modality               | Therapeutic radiographer |
| First intake           | 01 September 2003        |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 16                 |
| Intakes per year       | 1                        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07590                  |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | Birmingham City University   |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time<br>BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Part time |
| Date submission received | 26 March 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13738-Q8N9Z4   |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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



## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|               |                                   |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| Clare Attrill | Speech and language therapist     |
| Tony Scripps  | Operating department practitioner |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive                    |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                         |
| Profession             | Speech and language therapist          |
| First intake           | 01 September 2001                      |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 101                              |
| Intakes per year       | 1                                      |
| Assessment reference   | AM07591                                |

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy |
| Mode of study  | PT (Part time)                         |
| Profession     | Speech and language therapist          |

|                        |                   |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| First intake           | 01 September 2001 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 101         |
| Intakes per year       | 1                 |
| Assessment reference   | AM07592           |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** In a review of the documentation, the education provider submitted a programme leader description of how they would ensure that the individual appointed within this role will be appropriately qualified and experienced. From reviewing this information the visitors understood how the education provider ensures that the person within this role will be appropriately qualified and experienced to lead the programme. However, from this information the visitors were not able to establish how the education provider would identify and appoint a suitable replacement to lead the programme if this was required. Therefore, the education provider must outline how the education provider would be able to identify a suitable replacement to this programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Information to demonstrate how the education provider appoints a suitable replacement to lead the programme, if it becomes necessary.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | Birmingham City University                          |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time |
| Date submission received | 05 April 2019                                       |
| Case reference           | CAS-13741-X1M0J6                                    |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|               |                                   |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| Clare Attrill | Speech and language therapist     |
| Tony Scripps  | Operating department practitioner |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive                    |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                           |
| Profession             | Operating department practitioner        |
| First intake           | 01 August 2016                           |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40                                 |
| Intakes per year       | 1  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07595                                  |

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

## Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** In a review of the documentation, the visitors were provided with a person specification for the role. From reviewing this information the visitors understood how the education provider ensures that the person within this role will be appropriately qualified and experienced to lead the programme. However, from this information the visitors were not able to establish how the education provider would identify and appoint a suitable replacement to lead the programme if this was required. Therefore, the education provider must outline how the education provider would be able to identify a suitable replacement to this programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Information to demonstrate how the education provider appoints a suitable replacement to lead the programme, if it becomes necessary.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | University of Bedfordshire                          |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time |
| Date submission received | 05 March 2019                                       |
| Case reference           | CAS-13740-F1N1K0                                    |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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



## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

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

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                           |
| Profession             | Operating department practitioner        |
| First intake           | 01 September 2016                        |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 24                                 |
| Intakes per year       | 1  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07599                                  |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the education provider has provided educational audits for practice-based learning. The visitors understood that there is a tool in place which the education provider uses to provide practice-based learning for learners. However, the visitors were unclear how the education provider ensures the audit tool is implemented and practice-based learning is secured for all learners. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence of an example of the action plan to secure practice-based learning for all learners.

### **3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.**

**Reason:** The education provider has mentioned peer assisted learning (PAL) in their documentary submission for this standard. However, from the information provided in the submission the visitors were unclear how PAL is structured or how it is implemented. The visitors were unable to determine how this would ensure learners are involved in the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information about how the education provider ensures learners are involved in the programme, to determine whether this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence on PAL and how it is structured and implemented, and how this ensures learners are involved in the programme.

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the education provider has provided the CVs of their staff. The visitors noted that staff numbers were decreased from five to four. However, the visitors were presented with three CVs of staff. The visitors were not clear what the current number of staff is from this information. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine whether there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place. The visitors require further evidence which confirms staff numbers for the programme, which demonstrates there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence which demonstrates there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the education provider mapped certain documents which were not included as part of the submission documentation. The visitors were not clear how learners would raise their concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. As the information was not provided, the visitors could also not determine how learners would access this information. The visitors were unable to determine the process in place to support learners in raising their concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users and carers. In particular, the visitors require to see further evidence which includes the following documents as referenced in the mapping document: "cause for concern" and "learner development tool for early escalation".

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence which demonstrates the "cause for concern" and "learner development tool for early escalation" as referenced in the mapping form.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Bedfordshire   |
| Name of programme(s)     | Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice, Full time |
| Date submission received | 04 February 2019   |
| Case reference           | CAS-13751-Z3Z0Z4   |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

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

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)  |
| Profession             | Operating department practitioner                         |
| First intake           | 01 September 2002   |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 26  |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07600   |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

#### 3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

**Reason:** The education provider has mentioned in their mapping document that the Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice programme is admitting no more learners on the programme. However, the visitors were unclear how current learners on the programme will be managed while the programme is scaling down. The visitors were unable to understand how learners are informed of the closure of this programme and whether this will affect their studies on the current Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice programme. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine how the programme is effectively managed and they require further evidence to ensure that the standard continues to be met.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence on the closure of the programme such as a closure form. Additionally, further evidence on how learners are informed of the programme closure.

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the education provider mapped certain documents which are not included as part of the submission documentation. The visitors were not clear how learners would raise their concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. As the information was not provided, the visitors could also not determine how learners would access this information. The visitors were unable to determine the process in place to support learners in raising their concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users and carers. In particular, the visitors require to see further evidence which includes the following documents as referenced in the mapping document: “cause for concern” and “learner development tool for early escalation”.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence which demonstrates the “cause for concern” and “learner development tool for early escalation” as referenced in the mapping form.

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the education provider has mentioned there is the ICare conference to facilitate collaboration between learners. The visitors understood that interprofessional learning occurs among midwives, paramedics and operating department practitioners. However the visitors were unable to find any further evidence in terms of how the elements for delivering interprofessional learning are structured to satisfy this standard. The visitors were unable to determine how learners on the programme are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence on how interprofessional learning is structured within the programme, with possible supporting documentation such as timetabling which demonstrates how the programme will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learning in other relevant professions.

## **Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation**

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).



## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Birmingham   |
| Name of programme(s)     | Doctorate in Forensic Psychology Practice (ForenPsyD), Part time<br>Doctorate in Forensic Psychology Practice (ForenPsyD), Full time |
| Date submission received | 04 April 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13744-D8N5K3   |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| Emcee Chekwas | Practitioner psychologist - Forensic psychologist |
| Sally Evans   | Practitioner psychologist - Forensic psychologist |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive                                    |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Doctorate in Forensic Psychology Practice (ForenPsyD) |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)  |
| Profession             | Practitioner psychologist                             |
| Modality               | Forensic psychologist                                 |
| First intake           | 01 January 2002                                       |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10  |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07603   |

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Doctorate in Forensic Psychology Practice (ForenPsyD) |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)  |
| Profession             | Practitioner psychologist                             |
| Modality               | Forensic psychologist                                 |
| First intake           | 01 January 2002                                       |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10  |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07605   |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Brighton                 |
| Name of programme(s)     | Independent Prescribing (1), Part time |
| Date submission received | 05 February 2019                       |
| Case reference           | CAS-13785-R7B8J2                       |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| James Pickard | Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration) |
| Nicola Carey  | Independent prescriber  |
| Niall Gooch   | HCPC executive  |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                             |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Programme name         | Independent Prescribing (1) |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)              |
| Entitlement            | Independent prescribing     |
| First intake           | 01 January 2014             |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40                    |
| Intakes per year       | 1                           |
| Assessment reference   | AM07633                     |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

| <b>Required documentation</b>  | <b>Submitted</b> | <b>Reason(s) for non-submission</b>   |
|--|------------------|---|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes              |   |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes              |   |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes              |   |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | No               | The education provider stated that they did not issue a response to the external examiners' reports as no issues were identified. |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years               | Yes              |   |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years               | Yes              |   |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Brighton                                 |
| Name of programme(s)     | MSc Podiatry (pre-registration), Full time accelerated |
| Date submission received | 03 April 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13787-R8D2J2                                       |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

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

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                 |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name         | MSc Podiatry (pre-registration) |
| Mode of study          | FTA (Full time accelerated)     |
| Profession             | Chiropodist / podiatrist        |
| First intake           | 01 September 2017               |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15                        |
| Intakes per year       | 1                               |
| Assessment reference   | AM07637                         |

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



### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

| Required documentation   | Submitted | Reason(s) for non-submission  |
|--|-----------|---|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |   |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | No        | Only one year's worth of documentation was provided as the programme started in September 2017. |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | No        | Only one year's worth of documentation was provided as the programme started in September 2017. |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | No        | Only one year's worth of documentation was provided as the programme started in September 2017. |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years               | No        | Only one year's worth of documentation was provided as the programme started in September 2017. |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years               | No        | Only one year's worth of documentation was provided as the programme started in September 2017. |

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### **Further evidence required**

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

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

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

**Reason:** In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted the education provider had provided us with the policy for the identification of course leader, in relation to MSc and PgDip Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) programmes. From the information provided, the visitors could not see information relating to the appointment of an individual with overall professional responsibility for the MSc Podiatry (pre-registration) programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

**Suggested evidence:** Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the MSc Podiatry (pre-registration) programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

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

**Reason:** In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors were made aware the education provider has a process for securing external practice-based learning, by receiving offers from placement providers. However, the visitors did not see information on the procedure for securing this external practice-based learning. As such, the visitors require further information on the process the education provider has in place to make sure all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs.

**Suggested evidence:** Information about the process the education provider has in place to make sure all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs.

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

**Reason:** In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had informed us there is a process in place for learners to raise concerns. However, the visitors were not able to find information about how learners access and are signposted to the policy, so they could understand their responsibilities regarding raising concerns when they believe the safety or wellbeing of service users is at risk. As such, the visitors require further information about how the education provider ensures learners are aware of the policy enabling them to report concerns they have about the safety and wellbeing of service users by speaking to an appropriate member of staff, such as an educator.

**Suggested evidence:** Information about how learners are made aware to understand their responsibilities regarding raising concerns when they believe the safety or wellbeing of service users is at risk.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | Canterbury Christ Church University          |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time |
| Date submission received | 29 March 2019                                |
| Case reference           | CAS-13771-J6G1M5                             |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Linda Mutema     | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Rachel Picton    | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Ismini Tsikaderi | HCPC executive                         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                   |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                    |
| Profession             | Radiographer                      |
| Modality               | Diagnostic radiographer           |
| First intake           | 01 July 2004                      |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 50                          |
| Intakes per year       | 1                                 |
| Assessment reference   | AM07646                           |

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

## Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** To demonstrate how they meet this standard, the education provider provided the role descriptor for the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. From the information provided, the visitors were unable to understand how the education provider will make a decision on the person being appropriate for this role and replace them if this becomes necessary. The visitors were unable to determine the process in place the education provider has to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate on the relevant part of the Register.

Therefore, the visitors require further evidence on the process to find an appropriate person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Information about the process in place to identify a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the education provider has provided evidence with their generic policy around raising concerns. The visitors noted that there is guidance on how learners can raise concerns. However, the visitors were unable to find how the education provider supports learners to recognise situations on the programme where they need to raise their concerns. Therefore the visitors were unable to determine whether there is an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors require further evidence on the process to support learners to identify cases where they need to raise their concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

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

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | Canterbury Christ Church University           |
| Validating body          | CCCU and University of Greenwich              |
| Name of programme(s)     | Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy, Full time |
| Date submission received | 1 April 2019                                  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13805-M4B8G4                              |

### Contents

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....                    | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                          | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....        | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review.....                  | 3 |
| Section 5: Visitors' recommendation .....                  | 4 |
| Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)..... | 4 |

### Executive Summary

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

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

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 6 of this report.



## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|               |                                   |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| Clare Attrill | Speech and language therapist     |
| Tony Scripps  | Operating department practitioner |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive                    |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                    |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Programme name         | Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                     |
| Profession             | Speech and language therapist      |
| First intake           | 01 February 2007                   |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25                           |
| Intakes per year       | 1                                  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07647                            |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** In a review of the documentation, the visitors were provided with a professional lead role descriptor. From reviewing this information the visitors understood how the education provider ensures that the person within this role will be appropriately qualified and experienced to lead the programme. However, from this information the visitors were not able to establish how the education provider would identify and appoint a suitable replacement to lead the programme if this was required. Therefore, the education provider must outline how the education provider would be able to identify a suitable replacement to this programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Information to demonstrate how the education provider appoints a suitable replacement to lead the programme, if it becomes necessary.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to this section at this time, but should consider whether to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future.

From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the responses to the external examiner report 2017-18 that the programme will be taught across two cohorts of the BSc. As such, the external examiner recommended recruiting another member of staff. This has been acknowledged by the programme director. The visitors would like to recommend that the education provider provides details on how the staffing issue is being managed through the next annual monitoring audit so the visitors can review this information and make a decision on whether our standards continue to be met.

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | Canterbury Christ Church University                 |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time |
| Date submission received | 29 March 2019                                       |
| Case reference           | CAS-13772-J0L5V3                                    |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|               |                                   |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| Clare Attrill | Speech and language therapist     |
| Tony Scripps  | Operating department practitioner |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive                    |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                           |
| Profession             | Operating department practitioner        |
| First intake           | 01 September 2009                        |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30                                 |
| Intakes per year       | 1  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07648                                  |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** In a review of the documentation, the visitors were provided with a role description of a programme leader. From reviewing this information the visitors understood the criteria by which the education provider makes a judgement that the person within this role is appropriately qualified and experienced to lead the programme. However, from this information the visitors were not able to establish how the education provider would identify and appoint a suitable replacement to lead the programme if this was required. Therefore, the education provider must outline how the education provider would be able to identify a suitable replacement to this programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Information to demonstrate how the education provider appoints a suitable replacement to lead the programme, if it becomes necessary.

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

**Reason:** In a review of the documentation, the education provider explained that an IPL conference has been delivered this academic year to second year students across the programme. However, details about this conference were not provided within the submission. Additionally, the visitors noted that the learners were able to engage with other registered professionals in the practice-based setting. However, from this information they were not able to establish how learners were able to learn with and from other professionals and learners in other relevant professions on the theoretical part of the programme. The visitors were not able to determine how learners would be prepared to work with other professionals and across professions for the benefit of service users. As such, the visitors were not able to determine what interprofessional education was available on the programme and whether all learners would have access to this. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that learners will have the opportunity to work with other learners and professionals across different professions through the programme. .

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to demonstrate that all learners are able to learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

### **Section 5: Visitors' recommendation**

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |                                      |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Education provider       | University of Central Lancashire     |
| Name of programme(s)     | Dip HE Paramedic Practice, Full time |
| Date submission received | 28 February 2019                     |
| Case reference           | CAS-13822-Y9X8L2                     |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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



## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                 |                        |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Gemma Howlett   | Paramedic              |
| Rosemary Furner | Independent prescriber |
| Niall Gooch     | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                           |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Programme name         | Dip HE Paramedic Practice |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)            |
| Profession             | Paramedic                 |
| First intake           | 01 September 2009         |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 50                  |
| Intakes per year       | 1                         |
| Assessment reference   | AM07660                   |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** In their evidence for this standard, the education provider submitted a curriculum vitae for the new programme leader and stated that this individual was a registered paramedic. Additionally, they could not determine whether the education provider had an effective process in place to identify and appoint a new programme leader if it became necessary to do so. They were therefore unable to make a judgment about whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that the education provider has a process in place for ensuring that, if it becomes necessary, an appropriate replacement can be recruited.

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

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed a flow chart for learners showing them what steps to take if they needed to raise concerns about safety and wellbeing of service users. They considered that this was broadly appropriate and comprehensive. However, they could not see from the evidence submitted how learners were supported and enabled to raise concerns outside of normal working hours. The people mentioned as key contacts appeared from their job titles to be individuals who would not normally be available at such times. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how learners are supported and enabled to raise concerns out of normal working hours.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how learners are given explicit guidance on what steps to take and who to contact if they need to raise concerns out-of-hours.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | Coventry University   |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Outreach), Part time<br>BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time<br>BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Part time<br>BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Work based learning |
| Date submission received | 01 March 2019   |
| Case reference           | CAS-13830-Y9B9H2  |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Dawn Blenkin   | Occupational therapist                            |
| James McManus  | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Patrick Armsby | HCPC executive                                    |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Outreach) |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)                             |
| Profession             | Occupational therapist                     |
| First intake           | 01 September 2013                          |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20                                   |
| Intakes per year       | 1  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07663                                    |

|                |                                 |
|----------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study  | FT (Full time)                  |

|                        |                        |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Profession             | Occupational therapist |
| First intake           | 01 September 1997      |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 115              |
| Intakes per year       | 1                      |
| Assessment reference   | AM07670                |

|                        |                                 |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)                  |
| Profession             | Occupational therapist          |
| First intake           | 01 September 1997               |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30                        |
| Intakes per year       | 1                               |
| Assessment reference   | AM07671                         |

|                        |                                 |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study          | WBL (Work based learning)       |
| Profession             | Occupational therapist          |
| First intake           | 01 September 1997               |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30                        |
| Intakes per year       | 1                               |
| Assessment reference   | AM07672                         |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | Yes |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### **Further evidence required**

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

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

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

**Reason:** The education provider has provided the CV for the current programme lead in order to show this standard has been met. This standard is intended to ensure that the education provider (not the HCPC) ensures that the individual fulfilling this role is suitably qualified, and, the visitors were not clear how the CV for the current programme lead ensures this. We need to see evidence that there is an effective process in place to identify a suitable programme lead and if necessary, a suitable replacement. Therefore, the visitors require evidence that there is an appropriate process in place to ensure the suitability of the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme, and if required, a suitable replacement.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that demonstrates how the education provider ensures the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

### **3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.**

**Reason:** In order to evidence this standard, the visitors were shown comments made by learners in the Course Quality Enhancement and monitoring (CQEM) document and the student forum meeting notes that highlighted learner comments about the programme. While this highlighted learner engagement, visitors were unclear of how learner comments were used by the programme team, or how learners were made aware of the actions that the education provider has taken as a result of their engagement. Therefore, the education provider must provide further information which demonstrated how learners are involved in the programme in a meaningful way.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence which demonstrates how comments that have been gathered have been responded to and / or actioned by the programme team, or other evidence to demonstrate how learners are involved in the programme in a meaningful way.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).



## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | Coventry University  |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Leicester), Full time<br>BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time |
| Date submission received | 27 February 2019   |
| Case reference           | CAS-13825-Y2H4C7   |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Angela Duxbury   | Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer |
| Janet Lawrence   | Physiotherapist                         |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive                          |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                      |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Leicester) |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                       |
| Profession             | Physiotherapist                      |
| First intake           | 01 September 2005                    |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 130                            |
| Intakes per year       | 1                                    |
| Assessment reference   | AM07668                              |

|                |                          |
|----------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study  | FT (Full time)           |
| Profession     | Physiotherapist          |
| First intake   | 01 August 2018           |

|                        |           |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 130 |
| Intakes per year       | 1         |
| Assessment reference   | AM07673   |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the education provider has stated that the person with overall professional responsibility is on the relevant part of the Register, and provided a curriculum vitae. This is a revised standard, and we now require the

education provider to show us how they identify a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. Therefore, the visitors require information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

**Suggested evidence:** Information about the process in place to identify a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Cumbria  |
| Name of programme(s)     | Dip HE Paramedic Practice (HM Armed Forces), FT (Full time)<br>Dip HE Paramedic Practice (HM Armed Forces), PT (Part time) |
| Date submission received | 02 April 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13834-N6D3V1   |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                 |                        |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Gordon Pollard  | Paramedic              |
| Julie-Anne Lowe | Occupational therapist |
| Patrick Armsby  | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Dip HE Paramedic Practice (HM Armed Forces) |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                              |
| Profession             | Paramedic                                   |
| First intake           | 01 September 2015                           |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30                                    |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07680                                     |

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Programme name | Dip HE Paramedic Practice (HM Armed Forces) |
| Mode of study  | PT (Part time)                              |
| Profession     | Paramedic                                   |
| First intake   | 01 September 2015                           |

|                        |          |
|------------------------|----------|
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year       | 1        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07681  |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Cumbria                        |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time |
| Date submission received | 04 April 2019                                |
| Case reference           | CAS-13836-Y7J4C9                             |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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



## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Linda Mutema     | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Rachel Picton    | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Ismini Tsikaderi | HCPC executive                         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                   |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                    |
| Profession             | Radiographer                      |
| Modality               | Diagnostic radiographer           |
| First intake           | 01 January 1992                   |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 70                          |
| Intakes per year       | 1                                 |
| Assessment reference   | AM07684                           |

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

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

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

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

**Section 4: Outcome from first review**

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

**Further evidence required**

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

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

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

**Reason:** To demonstrate how they meet this standard, the education provider provided the role descriptor for the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. From the information provided, the visitors were unable to understand how the education provider will make a decision on the person being appropriate for this role and replace them if this becomes necessary. The visitors were unable to determine the process in place the education provider has to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced

and, unless other arrangements are appropriate on the relevant part of the Register. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence on the process to find an appropriate person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Information about the process in place to identify a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the education provider has provided a web link with a platform where learners can access further information around their generic policy for raising concerns. The visitors noted that there is guidance on how learners can raise concerns. However, the visitors were unable to find how the education provider supports learners to recognise situations on the programme where they need to raise their concerns. Therefore the visitors were unable to determine whether there is an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors require further evidence on the process to support learners to identify cases where they need to raise their concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

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

## **Section 5: Visitors' recommendation**

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Cumbria                    |
| Name of programme(s)     | DipHE Paramedic Practice, FT (Full time) |
| Date submission received | 04 April 2019                            |
| Case reference           | CAS-13782-F2Q1Z6                         |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                 |                        |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Gordon Pollard  | Paramedic              |
| Julie-Anne Lowe | Occupational therapist |
| Patrick Armsby  | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name         | DipHE Paramedic Practice |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)           |
| Profession             | Paramedic                |
| First intake           | 01 March 2017            |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25                 |
| Intakes per year       | 1                        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07691                  |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

| Required documentation   | Submitted | Reason(s) for non-submission   |
|--|-----------|--|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |  |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | No        | The first intake for the DipHE Paramedic Practice was April 2017. The documentation for academic year 2017-18 was available to review. |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | No        | The first intake for the DipHE Paramedic Practice was April 2017. The documentation for academic year 2017-18 was available to review. |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | No        | The first intake for the DipHE Paramedic Practice was April 2017. The documentation for academic year 2017-18 was available to review. |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years               | No        | The first intake for the DipHE Paramedic Practice was April 2017. The documentation for academic year 2017-18 was available to review. |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years               | No        | The first intake for the DipHE Paramedic Practice was April 2017. The documentation for academic year 2017-18 was available to review. |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | University of Cumbria                             |
| Name of programme(s)     | Dip HE Paramedic Practice (NWASt), FLX (Flexible) |
| Date submission received | 04 April 2019                                     |
| Case reference           | CAS-14826-B1S2H9                                  |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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



## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                 |                        |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Gordon Pollard  | Paramedic              |
| Julie-Anne Lowe | Occupational therapist |
| Patrick Armsby  | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                  |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Programme name         | Dip HE Paramedic Practice (NAST) |
| Mode of study          | FLX (Flexible)                   |
| Profession             | Paramedic                        |
| First intake           | 01 January 2016                  |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15                         |
| Intakes per year       | 1                                |
| Assessment reference   | AM08589                          |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | De Montfort University                               |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology), Full time |
| Date submission received | 31 January 2019                                      |
| Case reference           | CAS-13793-L6Z8H6                                     |

### Contents

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....                    | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                          | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....        | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review.....                  | 3 |
| Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation .....                  | 5 |
| Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)..... | 5 |

### Executive Summary

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

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

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 6 of this report.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| Catherine Smith | Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – sale / supply) |
| Elizabeth Ross  | Hearing aid dispenser  |
| Niall Gooch     | HCPC executive   |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology) |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                            |
| Profession             | Hearing aid dispenser                     |
| First intake           | 01 September 2011                         |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 35                                  |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07703                                   |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### **Further evidence required**

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

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

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

**Reason:** In their evidence for this standard, the education provider submitted curriculum vitae and the record of a major change submitted to the HCPC when the programme leader last changed. The visitors noted that the existing programme leader appeared to be appropriately qualified and experienced. However, they could not determine whether the education provider had a process in place to appoint a new

programme leader if it became necessary to do so. Additionally, the visitors were aware that the education provider had decided that it would not always be necessary for the person with overall professional responsibility to be an HCPC registered hearing aid dispenser. This was reasonable in the context of the programme, but the visitors were not clear under what circumstances the education provider would waive the registration requirement. Given these considerations, it was not clear how the education provider could ensure that future programme leaders were suitable for the role.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating

- that the education provider has a process for ensuring that the persons appointed to have overall professional responsibility for the programme are appropriate; and
- how the education provider determines when it is appropriate to waive a requirement for HCPC registration in programme leaders.

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

**Reason:** In their evidence for this standard, the education provider submitted a short narrative of how they introduce learners to subjects like professional behaviour and patient-centred care. They also referred the visitors to a number of elements of their submission, including learning outcomes and parts of the programme handbook which introduce learners to the role of tutors and practice educators. However, the visitors were not clear from this evidence what process was in place to ensure that learners would be supported and enabled to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users where necessary. They were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require further evidence relating to the education provider's process for supporting and enabling learners to raise concerns.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence outlining what process is in place for learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, and how this is communicated to learners.

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

**Reason:** In their evidence for this standard the education provider referred to learning outcomes from some of the programme modules. When the visitors looked at these learning outcomes, they could not see how specifically they related to the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). The learning outcomes did make references to professionalism but it was not clear how they were aligned to any specific requirements, so the visitors were unable to determine how learners would be enabled to understand and meet the SCPEs.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating how the education provider uses learning outcomes to ensure that learners are enabled to understand and meet the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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

**Reason:** In their evidence for this standard the education provider submitted a short description of their approach to inter-professional education (IPE), and referred to the parts of the programme where this was delivered. The visitors, however, were not clear from this evidence what was actually involved in IPE on the programme, in particular whether learners were able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions. They were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating how the IPE components of the programme ensure that learners are able to learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

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

**Reason:** In their evidence for this standard the education provider referred to those parts of the programme where professional competencies and behaviours were assessed. When the visitors looked at these assessments, they could not see how specifically they related to the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). The guidance for the assessments did make references to professionalism but it was not clear how they were aligned to any specific requirements, so the visitors were unable to determine how learners would be enabled to understand and meet the SCPEs.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating how the education provider uses assessment in all parts of the programme to ensure that learners are enabled to understand and meet the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

### Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

### Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this

report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

The visitors considered that SET 4.9 had been met at threshold, as the education provider had clarified how they would ensure that learners on the programme had access to workshops and study days during which they would be enabled to learn with, and from, learners in other relevant professions. The visitors were satisfied that these activities had been planned to ensure the involvement of appropriate other professionals and learners.

The visitors did note, however, that the evidence they had seen to support this standard was challenging to look at holistically. They suggest that in future monitoring processes the education provider should ensure that they can present the evidence for this standard in the way most likely to help the visitors understand how the standard is met.



## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | De Montfort University                                |
| Name of programme(s)     | Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology, Full time |
| Date submission received | 17 January 2019                                       |
| Case reference           | CAS-14363-V0L5K2                                      |

### Contents

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....                    | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                          | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....        | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review.....                  | 3 |
| Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation .....                  | 5 |
| Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)..... | 5 |

### Executive Summary

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

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

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 6 of this report.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| Catherine Smith | Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – sale / supply) |
| Elizabeth Ross  | Hearing aid dispenser  |
| Niall Gooch     | HCPC executive   |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                             |
| Profession             | Hearing aid dispenser                      |
| First intake           | 01 January 2008                            |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 35                                   |
| Intakes per year       | 1  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07705                                    |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### **Further evidence required**

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

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

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

**Reason:** In their evidence for this standard, the education provider submitted a curriculum vitae and stated that the existing programme leader had been in post for several years since the programme's initial approval. The visitors noted that this person appeared to be appropriately qualified and experienced. However, they could not determine whether the education provider had a process in place to appoint a new

programme leader if it became necessary to do so, and so it was not clear whether the standard was met.

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

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

**Reason:** In their evidence for this standard, the education provider directed the visitors to several parts of the programme handbook. However, it was not clear to the visitors how this information was relevant to supporting and enabling learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. In the evidence provided there did not appear to be information for learners about how to raise concerns appropriately, or guidance about what bad practice might look like. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met. The visitors considered that it was particularly important for this to be clear given the structure of the programme, in which learners' practice-based learning was with their existing employer. This could make it harder for learners to raise concerns when appropriate.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence showing specifically a process for how learners are enabled and supported to raise concerns arising from practice-based learning.

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

**Reason:** The evidence provided for this standard included a reference to the programme-level learning outcomes, and to the learning outcomes from the Professional Practice modules. This evidence made reference to requirements of professionalism and good conduct. However, it did not make specific reference to the HCPC's expectations, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). The evidence also did not make clear that learners were enabled to understand and meet expectations of behaviour, including the SCPEs, throughout the whole programme. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence showing that module-level learning outcomes throughout the programme ensure that learners are able to understand and meet expectations of professional behaviour.

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

**Reason:** In their evidence for this standard the education provider stated that various sessions during the programme were delivered by members of other professions. They included an "overview of the programme" which showed the scheduling for these sessions. However, the visitors considered that this did not constitute evidence demonstrating that all learners would be able to learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions. There were no details of what would happen during the sessions mentioned above. It was therefore unclear whether they would give

learners the opportunity to learn with and from other professionals, and whether they would involve learners from other professions. Additionally it was unclear how the education provider had made decisions about which professions were most appropriate and relevant, and why they had decided to approach meeting the standard in the way they did. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence showing

- how the inter-professional education activities on the programme enable all learners to learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions, and
- how decisions about designing and delivering IPE were made to ensure relevance and benefit for learners.

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

**Reason:** The evidence submitted by the education provider for this standard included an extract dealing from the Practical Proficiency Handbook & Record dealing with professional conduct and ethics issues. This was used throughout the programme as part of continuous assessment of learners' professional behaviour. However, the visitors noted that this document did not make specific reference to the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). The categories against which the learners would be assessed were broad and it was not clear how they were aligned to the SCPEs. The visitors were therefore unable to determine that the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that, throughout the programme, assessment of learners' ability to meet expectations of professional behaviour is clearly aligned to the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this

report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

The visitors considered that SET 4.9 had been met at threshold, as the education provider had clarified how they would ensure that learners on the programme had access to workshops and study days during which they would be enabled to learn with, and from, learners in other relevant professions. The visitors were satisfied that these activities had been planned to ensure the involvement of appropriate other professionals and learners.

The visitors did note, however, that the evidence they had seen to support this standard was challenging to look at holistically. They suggest that in future monitoring processes the education provider should ensure that they can present the evidence for this standard in the way most likely to help the visitors understand how the standard is met.

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | University of Greenwich                       |
| Validating body          | CCCU and University of Greenwich              |
| Name of programme(s)     | Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy, Full time |
| Date submission received | 18 April 2019                                 |
| Case reference           | CAS-13856-C3X9D2                              |

### Contents

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....                    | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                          | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....        | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review.....                  | 3 |
| Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation .....                  | 4 |
| Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)..... | 4 |

### Executive Summary

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

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

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 6 of this report.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|               |                                   |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| Clare Attrill | Speech and language therapist     |
| Tony Scripps  | Operating department practitioner |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive                    |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                    |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Programme name         | Pg Dip Speech and Language Therapy |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                     |
| Profession             | Speech and language therapist      |
| First intake           | 01 February 2007                   |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 12                           |
| Intakes per year       | 1                                  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07716                            |

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



### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** In a review of the documentation, the visitors were provided with a professional lead role descriptor. From reviewing this information the visitors understood how the education provider ensures that the person within this role will be appropriately qualified and experienced to lead the programme. However, from this information the visitors were not able to establish how the education provider would identify and appoint a suitable replacement to lead the programme if this was required. Therefore, the education provider must outline how the education provider would be able to identify a suitable replacement to this programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Information to demonstrate how the education provider appoints a suitable replacement to lead the programme, if it becomes necessary.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to this section at this time, but should consider whether to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future.

From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the responses to the external examiner report 2017-18 that the programme will be taught across two cohorts of the BSc. As such, the external examiner recommended recruiting another member of staff. This has been acknowledged by the programme director. The visitors would like to recommend that the education provider provides details on how the staffing issue is being managed through the next annual monitoring audit so the visitors can review this information and make a decision on whether our standards continue to be met.

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Hertfordshire                            |
| Name of programme(s)     | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy), Full time |
| Date submission received | 26 March 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13797-P4K2Y9                                       |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Gary Robinson  | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Sabiha Azmi    | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| John Archibald | HCPC executive                                    |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy) |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                              |
| Profession             | Practitioner psychologist                   |
| Modality               | Clinical psychologist                       |
| First intake           | 01 January 2000                             |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 17                                    |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07717                                     |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Hertfordshire                              |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging, Full time |
| Date submission received | 14 February 2019   |
| Case reference           | CAS-13798-Q0T7R0   |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Linda Mutema     | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Rachel Picton    | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Ismini Tsikaderi | HCPC executive                         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Imaging |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                                |
| Profession             | Radiographer                                  |
| Modality               | Diagnostic radiographer                       |
| First intake           | 01 September 2000                             |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 126                                     |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07720                                       |

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

## Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** To demonstrate how they meet this standard, the education provider stated that the current programme leader has a range of experiences and skills to support them in their role and provided their curriculum vitae. From the information provided, the visitors were unable to see how the education provider makes a decision about the person being appropriate for this role and replace them if this becomes necessary. The visitors were unable to determine the process in place the education provider has to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is



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

**Suggested evidence:** Information about the process in place to identify a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the education provider provided evidence including their generic policy around raising concerns. The visitors noted that there is also guidance on how learners can raise concerns. However, the visitors were unable to find how the education provider supports learners to recognise situations on the programme where they need to raise concerns. Therefore the visitors were unable to determine whether there is an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors require further evidence on the process to support learners to identify cases where they need to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

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

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the education provider has shown a table of the learning outcomes within the modules of the programme where learners' professional behaviour is assessed. The visitors noted that these learning outcomes are mapped across modules on the programme. However the visitors were unable to understand how the learning outcomes assess learner's behaviour throughout the programme. Therefore the visitors were unable to determine how assessments are performed throughout the programme to ensure learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider assesses learners' professional behaviour throughout the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Further evidence which demonstrates assessment throughout the programme to ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

## **Section 5: Visitors' recommendation**

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |                                 |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Education provider       | University of Hertfordshire     |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Dietetics, Full time |
| Date submission received | 05 March 2019                   |
| Case reference           | CAS-13867-F8Y5L0                |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| David Packwood  | Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist |
| Sara Smith      | Dietitian  |
| Lawrence Martin | HCPC executive                                       |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                      |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Dietetics |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)       |
| Profession             | Dietitian            |
| First intake           | 01 September 2006    |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30             |
| Intakes per year       | 1                    |
| Assessment reference   | AM07728              |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### **Further evidence required**

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

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

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the education provider has referred the visitors to the programme specifications and annual monitoring reports for 2016-17 and 2017-18. The annual monitoring reports include the name of the person who holds overall professional responsibility for the programme and in addition, the education provider submitted their curriculum vitae. This is a revised standard, and we now require the education provider to show us how they identify a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. Therefore, the visitors require information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

**Suggested evidence:** Information about how the education provider identifies a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | University of Huddersfield                  |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Full time) |
| Date submission received | 21 February 2019                            |
| Case reference           | CAS-13869-T7R1W1                            |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Dawn Blenkin   | Occupational therapist                            |
| James McManus  | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Patrick Armsby | HCPC executive                                    |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                 |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                  |
| Profession             | Occupational therapist          |
| First intake           | 01 September 2005               |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25                        |
| Intakes per year       | 1                               |
| Assessment reference   | AM07730                         |



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

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

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

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

**Section 4: Outcome from first review**

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

**Further evidence required**

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

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

**3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.**

**Reason:** The education provider has indicated an increase of learner numbers from 25 to 40 learners per cohort. The increased numbers will require effective use or increase of resources to ensure the programme is delivered effectively. The visitors were unable to determine how resources related to teaching, practice-based learning and physical

resources were being maintained following an increase in learner numbers. Visitors were not able to determine if the education provider and partner organisations had committed to providing enough resources to deliver the programme for all learners. Without understanding this, the visitors were unable to confirm that the programme will be sustainable with an increase in learner numbers. Therefore, the visitors require further information to ensure the programme remains sustainable and fit for purpose with the increase in numbers.

**Suggested evidence:** Visitors will need to see how resources will be utilised across all settings to ensure the programme is sustainable and fit for purpose.

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

**Reason:** The education provider has provided the CV for the current programme lead in order to show this standard has been met. This standard is intended to ensure that the education provider (not the HCPC) ensures that the individual fulfilling this role is suitably qualified, and the visitors were not clear how the CV for the current programme lead ensures this. We need to see evidence that there is an effective process in place to identify a suitable programme lead and if necessary, a suitable replacement. Therefore, the visitors require evidence that there is an appropriate process in place to ensure the suitability of the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme, and if required, a suitable replacement.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence that demonstrates how the education provider ensures the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

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

**Reason:** The education provider has increased learner numbers, visitors will need to ensure that practice-based learning is resourced appropriately for this increase in learner numbers. The education provider has indicated that they will be seeking to increase placement capacity to meet the demands of increased learner numbers. However, from the documents provided the visitors were unable to confirm that the education provider has an effective process in place to source placement numbers for 40 learners across each year. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine that the education provider will be able to provide the capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

**Suggested evidence:** Information which shows how the education provider ensures practice-based capacity will be in line with increased numbers across all 3 years of the programme.

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

**Reason:** The education provider has indicated that new members of staff have been recruited for the increase in learner numbers. In their evidence, the education provider

provided the names for the new members of staff and links to CVs for the existing members of staff. While the number of staff appears adequate the visitors will need to confirm that these newer members of staff are appropriately qualified and experienced in order to deliver the programme effectively.

**Suggested evidence:** Visitors would need to see the number of full time equivalents that will be teaching on the programme. Furthermore, they will need to be able to see how they are appropriately qualified to deliver the programme effectively.

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

**Reason:** The education provider has indicated an increase of learner numbers per cohort from 25 to 40. The education provider has indicated that the capacity for the 'Skills lab' has been increased. However the visitors were not provided with evidence that demonstrated how the skills lab, and any other relevant resources, had been increased beyond this statement in the mapping document. In the mapping, the education provider noted that "photographic evidence [of the skills lab] could be provided if required", and there was no mention of other resources that might need to be increased or used differently to manage the increase in learner numbers. Therefore, the visitors could not see how programme resources will be managed for the increase in learner numbers. The education provider will need to demonstrate how resources to support learning are sufficient for the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence which demonstrates how resources to support learning in all settings will be increased or efficiently utilised for the increase in numbers.

### **5.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.**

**Reason:** The education provider has indicated that they intend to source new placement numbers for the increased cohort. However, the visitors were unable to determine who would be teaching and supervising these placements. The visitors were unable to determine the plans to train or source appropriately qualified staff involved in the practice-based learning. The education provider will need to ensure practice-based staff are able to effectively support learning and assessment in all practice-based settings. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to ensure this standard continues to be met

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence which shows the plans or process for appointing new practice-based staff to ensure there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

## **Section 5: Visitors' recommendation**

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Huddersfield                                       |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time<br>BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Part time |
| Date submission received | 06 March 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13806-Y8R6M1   |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

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

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Podiatry      |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)           |
| Profession             | Chiropodist / podiatrist |
| First intake           | 01 September 1993        |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40                 |
| Intakes per year       | 1                        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07731                  |

|                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Podiatry      |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)           |
| Profession             | Chiropodist / podiatrist |
| First intake           | 01 September 2003        |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 12                 |
| Intakes per year       | 1                        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07733                  |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the education provider informed us the programme leader must be registered with the HCPC and is appointed through the annual appraisal system at the education provider. This appointment is then considered by education provider's senior management team. This standard requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen how the education provider appoints an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

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

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).



## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Huddersfield                           |
| Name of programme(s)     | Independent and Supplementary Prescribing, Part time |
| Date submission received | 08 February 2019                                     |
| Case reference           | CAS-13807-T7K4N2                                     |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                  |                        |
|------------------|------------------------|
| Christine Hirsch | Independent prescriber |
| Paul Bates       | Paramedic              |
| Niall Gooch      | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Independent and Supplementary Prescribing |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)                            |
| Entitlement            | Independent prescribing                   |
| First intake           | 01 February 2014                          |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 60                                  |
| Intakes per year       | 2   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07734                                   |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

| Required documentation   | Submitted | Reason(s) for non-submission  |
|--|-----------|---|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |   |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes       |   |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes       |   |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | No        | Education provider stated that no such responses were available as no issues requiring a response were made. This was accepted by the HCPC before the assessment day. |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years               | No        | Evidence was not submitted. No explanation received, see further evidence request under standard D.4 below.   |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years               | No        | Evidence was not submitted. No explanation received, see further evidence request under standard B.15 below.  |

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

## **B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.**

**Reason:** As part of their evidence, the education provider noted that there had been recent staff changes, and they submitted curriculum vitae of staff who were currently involved in teaching on the programme. The visitors noted that there did not appear, at present, to be a staff member with a background in pharmacology on the programme. Although the HCPC does not have a specific requirement that prescribing programmes must include pharmacologists on staff, the standards of prescribing do require that education providers ensure appropriate expertise to cover all curriculum areas. The visitors were not clear how the education provider ensured that, in the absence of a specialist pharmacologist, relevant areas of the programme would be delivered appropriately.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that the parts of the programme dealing with pharmacology are appropriately delivered in the absence of a specialist pharmacologist.

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

**Reason:** The education provider did not submit evidence relating to monitoring of service user and carer involvement for the last two academic years (2016-17) and (2017-18), which all education providers have been asked to provide as part of annual monitoring audits from the 2018-19 academic year. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether this standard was met, because they could not consider evidence of how service user and carer involvement in the programme is monitored. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence relating to the monitoring of service user and carer involvement, and how it is planned, evaluated and improved.

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

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

**Reason:** The education provider did not submit evidence relating to monitoring of practice-based learning for the last two academic years (2016-17) and (2017-18), which all education providers have been asked to provide as part of annual monitoring audits from the 2018-19 academic year. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether this standard was met, because they could not consider evidence of how practice-based learning is monitored. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence relating to how monitoring of practice-based learning works, and to how information generated by such monitoring is used as part of continuous improvement.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence showing how the education provider monitors the quality of practice-based learning, and how information generated by this monitoring is used as part of continuous improvement.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | King's College London                           |
| Name of programme(s)     | MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time |
| Date submission received | 21 March 2019                                   |
| Case reference           | CAS-13816-K3K0Q3                                |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Angela Duxbury   | Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer |
| Janet Lawrence   | Physiotherapist                         |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive                          |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                      |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Programme name         | MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                       |
| Profession             | Physiotherapist                      |
| First intake           | 01 September 2002                    |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20                             |
| Intakes per year       | 1                                    |
| Assessment reference   | AM07750                              |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).



## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |                                |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Education provider       | University of Liverpool        |
| Name of programme(s)     | Pg Dip Radiotherapy, Full time |
| Date submission received | 01 April 2019                  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13927-F4G3P1               |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Angela Duxbury   | Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer |
| Janet Lawrence   | Physiotherapist                         |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive                          |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name         | Pg Dip Radiotherapy      |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)           |
| Profession             | Radiographer             |
| Modality               | Therapeutic radiographer |
| First intake           | 01 January 2010          |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10                 |
| Intakes per year       | 1                        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07767                  |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Liverpool                |
| Name of programme(s)     | MSc Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time |
| Date submission received | 26 February 2019                       |
| Case reference           | CAS-13828-X8W4B4                       |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                 |                        |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Gemma Howlett   | Paramedic              |
| Rosemary Furner | Independent prescriber |
| Niall Gooch     | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                             |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Programme name         | MSc Non-Medical Prescribing |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)              |
| Entitlement            | Independent prescribing     |
| First intake           | 01 September 2017           |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20                    |
| Intakes per year       | 2                           |
| Assessment reference   | AM07768                     |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

| Required documentation   | Submitted | Reason(s) for non-submission   |
|--|-----------|--|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |  |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | No        | The NMP modules ran for the first time in 2017-18 so documentation is only available for a single year.                |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | No        | The NMP modules ran for the first time in 2017-18 so external examiner report only available for one year.             |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | No        | The NMP modules ran for the first time in 2017-18 so response to external examiner report only available for one year. |

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

#### **B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place to deliver an effective programme.**

**Reason:** The visitors were not clear from the evidence submitted that there were staff members who were able to act as a point of reference for learners from HCPC-regulated professions. This was because they were aware that a member of staff had left the programme team and been replaced, but were not sure of the identity of this

member of staff. They considered that if this former staff member had been an individual who was a point of reference for learners from HCPC-regulated professions, then it was possible that there was no longer appropriate support for such learners on the programme, as the replacement staff member was a registered nurse. Also, the programme was mostly staffed by registered nurses. Since the programme is approved for HCPC learners to be admitted, under the standards for prescribing the programme must maintain the staffing expertise to teach those learners. The visitors were therefore unable to determine that the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to clarify

- whether the staff changes have affected the ability of the programme to address the specialist needs of allied health professionals; and
- if so, evidence demonstrating how the programme ensures that there are staff who are appropriately qualified to be a reference point for learners from HCPC-regulated professions.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | London Metropolitan University   |
| Name of programme(s)     | Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology, Part time<br>Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology, Full time |
| Date submission received | 04 April 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13835-C2F4T5   |

### Contents

|   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | <b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | <b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | <b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review.....           | <b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b> |

### Executive Summary

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

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



## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| David Packwood  | Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist |
| Sara Smith      | Dietitian  |
| Lawrence Martin | HCPC executive                                       |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology |
| Mode of study          | Full time  |
| Profession             | Practitioner psychologist                        |
| Modality               | Counselling psychologist                         |
| First intake           | 01 January 2004                                  |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 11   |
| Intakes per year       | 1  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07783  |

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology |
| Mode of study          | Part time  |
| Profession             | Practitioner psychologist                        |
| Modality               | Counselling psychologist                         |
| First intake           | 01 January 2004                                  |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 11   |
| Intakes per year       | 1  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07782  |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

| Required documentation  | Submitted | Reason(s) for non-submission   |
|---|-----------|--|
| HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |  |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                          | Yes       |  |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                         | Yes       |  |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years            | No        | No responses required to the external examiners in 2017-2018. In the HPCPC cover letter the education providers clarifies the Performance Enhancement Meeting (PEM) minutes discuss the quality of the courses in the School of Psychology, including comments from EEs and any responses, if relevant |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years                | Yes       |  |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years                | Yes       |  |

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | Middlesex University                            |
| Name of programme(s)     | MSci Applied Biomedical Science, FT (Full time) |
| Date submission received | 04 February 2019                                |
| Case reference           | CAS-13942-B3M7N5                                |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

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

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                 |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name         | MSci Applied Biomedical Science |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                  |
| Profession             | Biomedical scientist            |
| First intake           | 01 September 2015               |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 4                         |
| Intakes per year       | 1                               |
| Assessment reference   | AM07797                         |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

| Required documentation   | Submitted | Reason(s) for non-submission  |
|--|-----------|---|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |   |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | No        | This was submitted for 2017-18, but not for 2016-17. Document, labelled 'amr 2016-17' only contains information for 2017-18 but not for 2016-17 |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | No        | Document was provided for the last 2 years, but the content was for BSc Programme only and not for Msci programme                               |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | No        | Documentation that was provided for the last 2 years had content for Bsc, not for MSci programme  |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years               | Yes       |   |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years               | Yes       |   |

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### **Further evidence required**

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

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

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

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted the education provider had provided the curriculum vitae of an appropriate and experienced person who holds overall professional responsibility for this programme. However, this standard now requires the education provider to demonstrate there is a process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As the visitors could not see any evidence of what process is in place to identify a suitable person or a replacement for this post, they could not determine whether this standard is met. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the process to ensure there is an effective process in place to identify a suitable person with overall professional responsibility for the programme and if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

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

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

**Reason:** As per the requirement for annual monitoring audits, the internal quality documents for 2016-7, the external examiner reports and the responses to them have not been provided for the last two academic years for this programme. The education provider has stated in the annual monitoring audit form that this was provided, however the content was different as stated in section 2. Without this evidence, the visitors were unable to determine if this standard has been met. Therefore, they require evidence showing the programmes have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place to be able to make a judgement regarding this standard.

**Suggested evidence:** External examiner documents for the last 2 academic years including responses to them and internal quality document for 2016-7 for the MSci Applied Biomedical Science to address this standard.

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

**Reason:** The visitors were directed to view the placement handbook, programme handbook and the training portfolio as evidence for this standard from the SET's mapping document. From the information provided, the visitors were unable to see evidence of any direct reference in the documentation to how learning outcomes address the ethics and professional behavioural expectations of this programme. As per the requirement for this standard, they could not see evidence within the learning outcomes to demonstrate how learners are expected to understand and be able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Therefore, the visitors require further information, which demonstrates the learning outcomes ensure learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour. In this way, the visitors will be able to make a judgement about whether this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating how the learning outcomes address expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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

**Reason:** As per the SETs mapping document, there was reference to the programme handbook and portfolio log book for this standard. In a review of the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine where the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) are assessed through the programme, in a way that will ensure learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour. This standard now requires that assessments throughout the programme ensure that learners are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs. As the visitors have not seen this within the documentation, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Appropriate evidence that shows how the assessments in the programme ensure that learners can demonstrate that they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour and the SCPEs for this standard.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).



## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | Newcastle University                                       |
| Name of programme(s)     | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol), Full time |
| Date submission received | 20 March 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13855-S0D1G0   |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Angela Duxbury   | Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer           |
| Sabiha Azmi      | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive                                    |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol) |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                                  |
| Profession             | Practitioner psychologist                       |
| Modality               | Clinical psychologist                           |
| First intake           | 01 January 1995                                 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 14  |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07812   |

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

## Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the education provider has stated that the person with overall professional responsibility is on the relevant part of the Register, and provided a curriculum vitae. This is a revised standard, and we now require the education provider to show us how they identify a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. Therefore, the visitors require information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

**Suggested evidence:** Information about the process in place to identify a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Nottingham   |
| Name of programme(s)     | Non medical prescribing for Allied Health Professionals, Degree level, Part time<br>Non medical prescribing for Allied Health Professionals, Masters level, Part time<br>Non medical prescribing for Allied Health Professionals, Degree level, Distance learning<br>Non medical prescribing for Allied Health Professionals, Masters level, Distance learning |
| Date submission received | 31 January 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13860-Z5M5F7   |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                  |                        |
|------------------|------------------------|
| Christine Hirsch | Independent prescriber |
| Paul Bates       | Paramedic              |
| Niall Gooch      | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Non medical prescribing for Allied Health Professionals, Degree level |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)  |
| Entitlement            | Independent prescribing   |
| First intake           | 01 August 2018  |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40  |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07818   |

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | Non medical prescribing for Allied Health Professionals, Masters level |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)   |
| Entitlement            | Independent prescribing  |
| First intake           | 01 August 2018   |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40   |
| Intakes per year       | 1  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07819  |

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Non medical prescribing for Allied Health Professionals, Degree level |
| Mode of study          | DL (Distance learning)  |
| Entitlement            | Independent prescribing   |
| First intake           | 01 August 2018  |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30  |
| Intakes per year       | 2   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07823   |

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | Non medical prescribing for Allied Health Professionals, Masters level |
| Mode of study          | DL (Distance learning)   |
| Entitlement            | Independent prescribing  |
| First intake           | 01 August 2018   |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30   |
| Intakes per year       | 2  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07824  |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

| Required documentation   | Submitted | Reason(s) for non-submission |
|--|-----------|------------------------------|
| HPCP annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |                              |

|  |     |   |
|--|-----|---|
| Internal quality reports from the last two years               | Yes |   |
| External examiner reports from the last two years              | Yes |   |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years | Yes |   |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years     | No  | Education provider did not submit evidence, see further evidence request below. |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years     | Yes |   |

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### **Further evidence required**

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

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

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

**Reason:** The education provider did not appear to have submitted evidence relating to monitoring of practice-based learning for the academic years 2016-17 and 2017-18, which all education providers have been asked to provide as part of annual monitoring audits from the 2018-19 academic year. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether this standard was met, because they could not consider evidence of how practice-based learning is monitored. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence relating to how monitoring of practice-based learning works, and to how information generated by such monitoring is used as part of continuous improvement.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence showing how the education provider monitors the quality of practice-based learning, and how information generated by this monitoring is used as part of continuous improvement.



## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | Oxford Brookes University  |
| Name of programme(s)     | Independent / Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professions (v300) PG level 7, Part time |
| Date submission received | 14 February 2019   |
| Case reference           | CAS-13868-X4T4D4   |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                 |                        |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Gemma Howlett   | Paramedic              |
| Rosemary Furner | Independent prescriber |
| Niall Gooch     | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Independent / Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professions (v300) PG level 7 |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)  |
| Entitlement            | Independent prescribing   |
| First intake           | 01 September 2014   |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10  |
| Intakes per year       | 2   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07835   |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

#### **A.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and professional entry standards.**

**Reason:** The visitors were not clear from the information provided how the education provider would determine whether applicants who did not have a degree-level qualification would be admitted to the programme, and if so how those applicants would be considered. The programme was an M-level programme. The visitors noted that the education provider intended to admit some advanced practitioners on to the programme, but it was possible that some of these individuals would not have been in formal education for some time and would not necessarily have a high level of academic qualification. They did not know what principles would be applied to determine whether these individuals should be admitted, and how equity of admissions would be ensured. They were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence clarifying what the academic criteria will be for admission to the programme.

## **B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.**

**Reason:** From the evidence provided, the visitors were aware that the education provider was planning to admit paramedics on to the programme following the change to legislation. However, they were not able to see evidence relating to how the education provider would ensure that paramedic learners on the programme would have access to appropriate profession-specific expertise and support. They were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that paramedic learners on the programme will have access to appropriate specialist expertise and knowledge to enable them to prescribe effectively and safely as paramedics.

## **C.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately identified and addressed.**

**Reason:** The visitors were not clear from the evidence submitted how the education provider plans to ensure that the profession-specific skills and knowledge of paramedics would be appropriately identified and addressed in the programme's inter-professional education components. They were aware that there was interprofessional learning but they could not see the detail of how paramedics would be integrated into this. They were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence showing how the needs of paramedic learners would be met in interprofessional learning, so that paramedics will be enabled to prescribe effectively and safely.

## **E.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from a relevant part of the HCPC Register**

**Reason:** From the evidence provided, the visitors were aware that a new external examiner had been appointed. On the nomination form, it stated that this individual would be able to provide "assurance" of whether the HCPC standards for prescribing were met by the programme. However, the visitors were not clear whether this individual was registered with the HCPC, and whether they had appropriate experience for the role. The education provider did not provide detail on whether the person was an HCPC registrant. If an external examiner is not HCPC-registered, an education provider would normally be expected to explain how they determined that their arrangements were appropriate. However, the education provider has not done this for this programme. The visitors are therefore unable to determine that the standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence clarifying whether the external examiner is an HCPC registrant, and if not, evidence showing how the education provider determined that they were an appropriate person to act as an external examiner for the programme.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | Oxford Brookes University   |
| Name of programme(s)     | FdSc Paramedic Emergency Care, Flexible<br>FdSc Paramedic Emergency Care, Part time<br>FdSc Paramedic Emergency Care, Full time |
| Date submission received | 26 February 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13968-C9K8Y2  |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                 |                        |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Gemma Howlett   | Paramedic              |
| Rosemary Furner | Independent prescriber |
| Niall Gooch     | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                               |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Programme name         | FdSc Paramedic Emergency Care |
| Mode of study          | FLX (Flexible)                |
| Profession             | Paramedic                     |
| First intake           | 01 September 2008             |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 8                       |
| Intakes per year       | 1                             |
| Assessment reference   | AM07837                       |

|                |                               |
|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Programme name | FdSc Paramedic Emergency Care |
| Mode of study  | PT (Part time)                |
| Profession     | Paramedic                     |
| First intake   | 01 September 2008             |



|                        |          |
|------------------------|----------|
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15 |
| Intakes per year       | 1        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07838  |

|                        |                               |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Programme name         | FdSc Paramedic Emergency Care |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                |
| Profession             | Paramedic                     |
| First intake           | 01 September 2008             |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20                      |
| Intakes per year       | 1                             |
| Assessment reference   | AM07844                       |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

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

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### **Further evidence required**

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

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

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

**Reason:** The evidence submitted for this standard included minutes of meetings of the subject committee and sections of the annual review. The mapping document also contained a narrative explaining how the programme met the standard. From the narrative the visitors understood that the education provider did have processes in place for ensuring availability and capacity of practice-based learning. However, it was not clear to the visitors how the evidence provided supported the narrative. It did not appear to show how the education provider's mechanisms for meeting the standard worked in practice. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how the education provider works with the Oxford Placement Capacity Management Group to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning.

### **3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.**

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence provided, including minutes of the Paramedic Subject Committee at which learners were represented. The narrative provided suggested that this committee was a central part of the way in which learners were involved in the programme. The visitors noted that learners did participate in these meetings. There were references to learners from the BSc-level programmes but not to learners from the foundation degrees. It was therefore not clear from the minutes that learners from the foundation-level programmes were participating. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show that learners from the foundation-level programmes are involved in the Paramedic Subject Committee.

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

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence provided, including information on the education provider's website, about raising concerns and whistleblowing. This information was broadly appropriate. However, the visitors noted that it was largely generic and did not provide specific guidance to paramedic learners which would enable and support them to raise concerns in the context of a paramedic learner. For example, there did not appear to be information about how to raise concerns outside normal working hours, or information about specific individuals to contact in particular circumstances. The mapping document mentioned a module that dealt with raising concerns, U43332 Developing Paramedic Skills, but the education provider had not submitted any information relating to this module, so the visitors could not make a judgment about how this module contributed to learners' understanding of how to raise concerns appropriately. The visitors also noted that the Practice Education Handbook mentioned in the mapping was labelled as being for the BSc programmes, and so it was not clear to them how it would ensure that foundation-level learners had an appropriate understanding of raising concerns. They were therefore unable to be clear that the standard was met, and require further evidence of an effective process for ensuring that learners on these programmes are able to raise concerns where appropriate.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show that learners on the foundation-level programmes have access to specific guidance about how to raise concerns in the paramedic context, especially about how to raise concerns out of normal work hours.

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

**Reason:** In the mapping document the education provider included a narrative of how the education provider incorporated the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) into the programme. These arrangements appeared to be broadly appropriate. However, it was not clear to the visitors how the evidence provided related to what was stated in the narrative, and the education provider had not made this clear. The visitors followed the links on the webpage that was submitted as evidence but could not find information about how the specific requirements of professionalism for HCPC registrants, as laid out in the SCPEs, had a prominent and structured role in the programme. The visitors were aware that the practice assessment document (PAD) did have explicit references to the SCPEs, but this did not seem to be the case in other evidence. Learning outcomes were not referenced in the education provider's submission. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how the education provider ensures that throughout the programme, the learning outcomes ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the HCPC SCPEs.

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

**Reason:** The education provider submitted a narrative laying out their approach to inter-professional education. In this narrative the education provider stated that they use practice-based learning and regular events with Buckinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service to ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions. The education provider cited as evidence the

module U43323 Developing Paramedic Practice, in which learners' ability to work appropriately with other professions is assessed. However, the visitors were not able to determine, in the absence of this evidence, that all learners would be able to meet the standard, rather than just learning or working alongside other professionals or learners. For example, the education provider did not submit evidence showing how they would ensure that all learners had appropriate access to suitable inter-professional education given the differences between different practice-based learning settings. The visitors were also not clear how the education provider had determined which professions were most relevant. They were therefore not able to determine that the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how the education provider makes sure that all learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions

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

**Reason:** In the mapping document the education provider included a narrative of how the education provider incorporated the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) into the programme. These arrangements appeared to be broadly appropriate. The education provider stated that they used assessment throughout the programme to ensure that learners were able to meet expectations of professional behaviour. However, it was not clear to the visitors how the evidence provided related to what was stated in the narrative. The visitors could not find information about how the programme used assessment to ensure that learners were able to demonstrate the specific requirements of professionalism for HCPC registrants, as laid out in the SCPEs. The visitors were aware that the practice assessment document (PAD) did have explicit references to assessment of learners' understanding of the SCPEs but it was not clear how this was achieved in the rest of the programme. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how the education provider ensures that throughout the programme, the learning outcomes ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the HCPC SCPEs.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#)

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | Queen's University of Belfast                            |
| Name of programme(s)     | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsych), Full time |
| Date submission received | 01 April 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13893-T0D7L4   |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Andrew Richards  | Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist |
| Ruth Baker       | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist    |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive                                       |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsych) |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                                |
| Profession             | Practitioner psychologist                     |
| Modality               | Clinical psychologist                         |
| First intake           | 01 January 1994                               |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 13                                      |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07854                                       |

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

## Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the education provider has stated that the person with overall professional responsibility is on the relevant part of the Register, and provided a curriculum vitae. This is a revised standard, and we now require the education provider to show us how they identify a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. Therefore, the visitors require information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

**Suggested evidence:** Information about the process in place to identify a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).



## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Salford  |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, FT (Full time)<br>BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, PT (Part time) |
| Date submission received | 04 April 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13986-W4S7H4   |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                 |                        |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Gordon Pollard  | Paramedic              |
| Julie-Anne Lowe | Occupational therapist |
| Patrick Armsby  | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                 |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)                  |
| Profession             | Occupational therapist          |
| First intake           | 01 September 1994               |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20                        |
| Intakes per year       | 1                               |
| Assessment reference   | AM07860                         |

|                |                                 |
|----------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study  | FT (Full time)                  |
| Profession     | Occupational therapist          |
| First intake   | 01 September 1994               |

|                        |          |
|------------------------|----------|
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 56 |
| Intakes per year       | 1        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07859  |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Salford                        |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time |
| Date submission received | 26 March 2019                                |
| Case reference           | CAS-13988-W0C6T7                             |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Linda Mutema     | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Rachel Picton    | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Ismini Tsikaderi | HCPC executive                         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                   |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                    |
| Profession             | Radiographer                      |
| Modality               | Diagnostic radiographer           |
| First intake           | 01 September 1992                 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 50                          |
| Intakes per year       | 1                                 |
| Assessment reference   | AM07863                           |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the education provider provided evidence including their generic policy around raising concerns. The visitors noted that there is guidance on how learners can raise concerns. However, the visitors were unable to find how the education provider supports learners to recognise situations on the programme where they need to raise concerns. Therefore the visitors were unable to determine whether there is an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors require further evidence on the process to support learners to identify cases where they need to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

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

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Salford  |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Full time<br>BSc (Hons) Podiatry, Part time |
| Date submission received | 28 March 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13899-K1V9L2   |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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



## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

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

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Podiatry      |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)           |
| Profession             | Chiropodist / podiatrist |
| First intake           | 01 September 1993        |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 60                 |
| Intakes per year       | 1                        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07865                  |

|                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Podiatry      |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)           |
| Profession             | Chiropodist / podiatrist |
| First intake           | 01 September 1993        |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15                 |
| Intakes per year       | 1                        |
| Assessment reference   | AM07866                  |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had provided information on their recruitment process undertaken to appoint an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. However, the visitors have not seen information relating to how the education provider ensures the individual is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the register. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

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

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | St George's, University of London            |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time |
| Date submission received | 02 April 2019                                |
| Case reference           | CAS-13904-P4P0D0                             |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Linda Mutema     | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Rachel Picton    | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Ismini Tsikaderi | HCPC executive                         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                   |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                    |
| Profession             | Radiographer                      |
| Modality               | Diagnostic radiographer           |
| First intake           | 01 January 1998                   |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 61                          |
| Intakes per year       | 1                                 |
| Assessment reference   | AM07871                           |

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

## Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** To demonstrate how they meet this standard, the education provider provided the person specification for the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme, and elements of the selection process. From the information provided, the visitors were unable to understand how the education provider will make a decision on the person being appropriate for this role and replace them if this becomes necessary. The visitors were unable to determine the process in place the education provider has to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate on the relevant part of the Register. Therefore, the visitors require further

evidence on the process to find an appropriate person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Information about the process in place to identify a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | St George's, University of London             |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography, Full time |
| Date submission received | 04 April 2019                                 |
| Case reference           | CAS-13906-B8S2Z5                              |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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



## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Angela Duxbury   | Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer |
| Janet Lawrence   | Physiotherapist                         |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive                          |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                    |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                     |
| Profession             | Radiographer                       |
| Modality               | Therapeutic radiographer           |
| First intake           | 01 January 1999                    |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30                           |
| Intakes per year       | 1                                  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07873                            |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | St George's, University of London   |
| Name of programme(s)     | Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing Health Professions Council (HPC) Members Level 6, Part time<br>PG Practice Cert in Supplementary Prescribing (Health Professions Council (HPC) members) Level 7, Part time<br>Prescribing: Independent and Supplementary, Part time |
| Date submission received | 11 April 2019   |
| Case reference           | CAS-13992-V7W8N3  |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                    |                        |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Alaster Rutherford | Independent prescriber |
| Matthew Catterall  | Paramedic              |
| Rabie Sultan       | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing Health Professions Council (HPC) Members Level 6 |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)   |
| Entitlement            | Supplementary prescribing  |
| First intake           | 01 April 2010  |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 75   |
| Intakes per year       | 2  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07874  |

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| Programme name | PG Practice Cert in Supplementary Prescribing (Health Professions Council (HPC) members) Level 7 |
|----------------|--|

|                        |                           |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)            |
| Entitlement            | Supplementary prescribing |
| First intake           | 01 April 2010             |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 70                  |
| Intakes per year       | 2                         |
| Assessment reference   | AM07876                   |

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | Prescribing: Independent and Supplementary           |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)                                       |
| Entitlement            | Supplementary Prescribing<br>Independent Prescribing |
| First intake           | 01 June 2016   |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 35   |
| Intakes per year       | 2  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07878  |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

| Required documentation   | Submitted | Reason(s) for non-submission  |
|--|-----------|---|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |   |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes       |   |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | No        | Report only provided for year 2017-18, not 2016-17. The education provider stated in the audit form, the reason for not providing this is due to having only two AHP learners enrolled in the past 2 years. |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | No        | Response provided for 2017-8, not 2016-7. The education provider stated the reason for not providing this is due to   |

|  |     |   |
|--|-----|---|
|  |     | having only two AHP learners enrolled in the past 2 years.  |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years | No  | No evidence provided for last two years. The education provider stated the reason for not providing this is due to having only two AHP learners enrolled in the past 2 years. |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years | Yes |   |

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### Further evidence required

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

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

### **B.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.**

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that no evidence of the monitoring of practice based learning for the last two years was provided, which is now a requirement for the audit. In addition, the external examiner report and responses were not provided for the year 2016-17. The education provider said that the reason for not providing these documents is because they have only had two AHP learners on the programme in the last two years, and so they found the information to be either not available or not relevant. However, the visitors do not expect that this information to be affected by the profession of learners on this generic programme, and therefore these should be available for the programme, even when no HCPC registrants are enrolled. The visitors consider that these documents are essential in ensuring that the programme continues to have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place. Without this information, the visitors were unable to determine if this standard has been met. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence to ensure they have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place for the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Document or relevant information demonstrating monitoring and evaluation of practice based learning for the last two years. External examiner report and external examiner response, for the year 2016-17.

## Section 5 : Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Sheffield                                |
| Name of programme(s)     | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy), Full time |
| Date submission received | 08 March 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13909-T3L9H0                                       |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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



## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Gary Robinson  | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Sabiha Azmi    | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| John Archibald | HCPC executive                                    |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy) |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                              |
| Profession             | Practitioner psychologist                   |
| Modality               | Clinical psychologist                       |
| First intake           | 01 January 1990                             |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 18                                    |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07880                                     |

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

## Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** In a review of the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware the programme director is registered with the HCPC. The visitors were informed no example of the process for appointing the programme director is available and were provided with a brief draft job description for the programme director position. This standard requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided, the visitors have not clearly seen how the education provider appoints an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about how the education provider ensures that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the

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

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

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Southampton                            |
| Name of programme(s)     | Independent and Supplementary Prescribing, Part time |
| Date submission received | 11 February 2019                                     |
| Case reference           | CAS-13999-J9M7G7                                     |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                  |                        |
|------------------|------------------------|
| Christine Hirsch | Independent prescriber |
| Paul Bates       | Paramedic              |
| Niall Gooch      | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Independent and Supplementary Prescribing |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)                            |
| Entitlement            | Independent prescribing                   |
| First intake           | 01 January 2014                           |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40                                  |
| Intakes per year       | 3   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07895                                   |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

| Required documentation   | Submitted | Reason(s) for non-submission  |
|--|-----------|---|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |   |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes       |   |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes       |   |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes       |   |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years               | No        | Monitoring was not submitted. No reason given by education provider, see further evidence request under standard D.4 below. |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years               | Yes       |   |

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** The education provider did not submit evidence relating to monitoring of practice-based learning, which all education providers have been asked to provide for the academic years 2016-17 and 2017-18 as part of annual monitoring audits from the 2018-19 academic year. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether this standard was met, because they could not consider evidence of how practice-based learning is monitored. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence relating to how monitoring of practice-based learning works, and how information generated by such monitoring is used as part of continuous improvement.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence showing how the education provider monitors the quality of practice-based learning, and how information generated by this monitoring is used as part of continuous improvement.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | University of Surrey                      |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Nutrition/Dietetics, Full time |
| Date submission received | 28 February 2019                          |
| Case reference           | CAS-13923-P0K4Z3                          |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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



## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| David Packwood  | Practitioner psychologist<br>Counselling psychologist |
| Sara Smith      | Dietitian   |
| Lawrence Martin | HCPC executive  |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Nutrition/Dietetics |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                 |
| Profession             | Dietitian                      |
| First intake           | 01 August 1997                 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 38                       |
| Intakes per year       | 1                              |
| Assessment reference   | AM07921                        |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the education provider provided the name of the person with overall professional responsibility and their curriculum vitae. This is a revised standard, and we now require the education provider to show how they identify a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. Therefore, the visitors require information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

**Suggested evidence:** Information about how the education provider identifies a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | Swansea University   |
| Name of programme(s)     | DipHE Paramedic Science, Full time<br>Diploma Higher Education Paramedic Science for<br>Emergency Medical Technicians, Part time |
| Date submission received | 02 April 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-14010-W4K7Z8   |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                    |                         |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| Alaster Rutherford | Independent Prescribing |
| Matthew Catterall  | Paramedic               |
| Rabie Sultan       | HCPC executive          |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                         |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Programme name         | DipHE Paramedic Science |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)          |
| Profession             | Paramedic               |
| First intake           | 01 September 2008       |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 50                |
| Intakes per year       | 1                       |
| Assessment reference   | AM07928                 |

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| Programme name | Diploma Higher Education Paramedic Science for Emergency Medical Technicians |
| Mode of study  | PT (Part time)   |

|                        |                   |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| Profession             | Paramedic         |
| First intake           | 01 September 2013 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15          |
| Intakes per year       | 1                 |
| Assessment reference   | AM07929           |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** From their review of the documentation, the visitors understood that existing learners, who work and live in North Wales, have the block-teaching element of the programme delivered to them in North Wales. This is different to arrangement for the learners traveling to Swansea. This was approved via the major change process last year; however, the visitors could not see any information regarding this in the practice-based learning documentation provided. From reviewing the evidence, the visitors could not determine how education provider ensures the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for learners in North Wales. The visitors were also not clear what contractual agreements are in place with the local trusts outside of Swansea, which would ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for learners in those areas. From the information provided,, to the visitors were unable make a judgement regarding the process in place for ensuring the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

**Suggested evidence:** Information that demonstrates the process to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for learners outside Swansea.

#### Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | University College London   |
| Name of programme(s)     | MSc Audiological Science with Clinical Practice, Full time<br>Postgraduate Diploma Audiological Science with Clinical Practice, Full time |
| Date submission received | 04 February 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-14011-K8P9K5  |

### Contents

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....                    | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                          | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....        | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review.....                  | 4 |
| Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation .....                  | 5 |
| Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)..... | 6 |

### Executive Summary

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

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

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 6 of this report



## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| Catherine Smith | Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – sale / supply) |
| Elizabeth Ross  | Hearing aid dispenser  |
| Niall Gooch     | HCPC executive   |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | MSc Audiological Science with Clinical Practice |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                                  |
| Profession             | Hearing aid dispenser                           |
| First intake           | 01 September 2014                               |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 14  |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07931   |

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | Postgraduate Diploma Audiological Science with Clinical Practice |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)   |
| Profession             | Hearing aid dispenser  |
| First intake           | 01 September 2014  |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 14   |
| Intakes per year       | 1  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07933  |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### **Further evidence required**

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

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

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

**Reason:** This new standard requires that the education provider has a process in place for ensuring that an appropriate person can be appointed, as the HCPC will no longer assess the suitability of all new programme leaders at the time of their appointment. In their evidence for this standard, the education provider directed the visitors to a narrative stating that head of the Ear Institute would be responsible for the appointment of a person with professional responsibility for the programmes. The visitors considered that this could be an appropriate part of a process. However, as they did not see any other evidence relating to the process, they were unable to make a judgment about whether the standard was met. They therefore require further evidence demonstrating how the education provider ensures – on an ongoing basis – that the person holding overall professional responsibility for a programme is suitable.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that an appropriate process is in place to ensure that any person appointed to hold overall professional responsibility for the programmes is suitable.

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

**Reason:** In their evidence for this standard the education provider provided a list of modules in which they said that there was shared learning with learners on other programmes. The visitors considered that this might be an appropriate approach to inter-professional education. However, the education provider did not submit any further evidence about the nature of the activities so the visitors were unable to make a judgment about whether learners on the programmes were enabled to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions. It was not clear how the education provider had determined which were the most relevant other professions, or the best way of organising and delivering inter-professional education. The visitors therefore require further evidence about how the education provider plans and delivers inter-professional education to ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, appropriate learners and professionals.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence showing how the education provider ensures that learners have able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

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

**Reason:** In their evidence the education provider submitted details of various modules in which expectations of professional behaviour were covered. The visitors noted that the programme contained input on professionalism and appropriate conduct. However, it was not clear to them from the evidence submitted how specifically the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) were covered throughout the programmes, as required in this revised standard. They therefore require further evidence relating to how the education provider ensures that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour including the SCPEs.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that at all levels of the programmes learners are enabled to understand and meet the HCPC SCPEs.

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

**Reason:** In their evidence the education provider submitted details of assessment in various parts of the programme which covered expectations of professional behaviour. The visitors noted that assessment on the programme addressed issues of professionalism and conduct. However, it was not clear to them from the evidence submitted how specifically the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) were assessed throughout the programmes, as required in this revised standard. They therefore require further evidence relating to how the education provider ensures that at all levels of the programmes, assessment is used appropriately to ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour including the SCPEs.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that at all levels of the programmes assessment is used to ensure that learners understand and meet the HCPC SCPEs.

### **Section 5: Visitors' recommendation**

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

The visitors considered that SET 3.3 had been met at threshold, as the education provider had explained how they would ensure that a person appointed to have overall professional responsibility for the programme would be appropriately qualified and experienced, and had described how a person appointed to that role would be supported as necessary. They had also provided assurances that the person would be required to have and maintain HCPC registration. The visitors did note, however, that the evidence they had seen to support this standard was presented by degrees and so was challenging to look at holistically. They suggest that in future monitoring processes the education provider should ensure that they can present the evidence for this standard in the way most likely to help the visitors understand how the standard is met. The visitors also noted that in the response to their request for further education there was a reference to “state regulation”. They considered that this was not the clearest way of describing the HCPC’s role and suggest that such terminology is not used in future.

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University College London                            |
| Name of programme(s)     | D.Ed.Psy Educational and Child Psychology, Full time |
| Date submission received | 05 February 2019                                     |
| Case reference           | CAS-13938-V4V0X7                                     |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Andrew Richards  | Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist |
| Ruth Baker       | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist    |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive                                       |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | D.Ed.Psy Educational and Child Psychology |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                            |
| Profession             | Practitioner psychologist                 |
| Modality               | Educational psychologist                  |
| First intake           | 01 January 2005                           |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 12                                  |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07935                                   |

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

## Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the education provider has stated that the person with overall professional responsibility is on the relevant part of the Register, and provided a curriculum vitae. This is a revised standard, and we now require the education provider to show us how they identify a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. Therefore, the visitors require information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.



**Suggested evidence:** Information about the process in place to identify a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | University of Suffolk   |
| Name of programme(s)     | Non-Medical Independent and/or Supplementary Prescribing, Part time<br>Non-Medical Supplementary Prescribing, Part time |
| Date submission received | 03 April 2019   |
| Case reference           | CAS-13940-G4F9T3  |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                    |                        |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Alaster Rutherford | Independent prescriber |
| Matthew Catterall  | Paramedic              |
| Rabie Sultan       | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | Non-Medical Independent and/or Supplementary Prescribing |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)   |
| Entitlement            | Supplementary Prescribing<br>Independent Prescribing     |
| First intake           | 01 January 2014  |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30   |
| Intakes per year       | 1  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07937  |

|                |                                       |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Programme name | Non-Medical Supplementary Prescribing |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|

|                        |                           |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)            |
| Entitlement            | Supplementary Prescribing |
| First intake           | 01 January 2014           |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 5                   |
| Intakes per year       | 1                         |
| Assessment reference   | AM07939                   |

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

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

#### **Further evidence required**

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

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

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

**Reason:** As per the requirements for this annual monitoring audit, the education provider must submit evidence of their service user and carer involvement monitoring for the last two years. When reviewing the audit documentation, the visitors were directed to the Health Sciences RiME report as evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The document highlighted the internal quality mechanisms within the department, including information on various activities such as current action plan which involved service users during the 2017-18 academic year. However, the visitors could not see any information regarding service users and carers involvement in the programme, and evidence of how this has been monitored for the last two years. Therefore, the visitors could not determine if this standard has been met.

**Suggested evidence:** Information demonstrating how service user and carer involvement takes place for this programme and how is it monitored. The education provider should be able to explain how monitoring took place for the last two years, and any outcomes of the monitoring (for example, identified areas for further development).

### **Section 5: Visitors' recommendation**

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | University of Suffolk                           |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, Full time |
| Date submission received | 10 April 2019                                   |
| Case reference           | CAS-14014-C4S6N2                                |

### Contents

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

### Executive Summary

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

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

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

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

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

### How we make our decisions

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

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

### HCPC panel

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

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Angela Duxbury   | Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer |
| Janet Lawrence   | Physiotherapist                         |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive                          |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                      |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                       |
| Profession             | Radiographer                         |
| Modality               | Therapeutic radiographer             |
| First intake           | 01 September 2011                    |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 22                             |
| Intakes per year       | 1                                    |
| Assessment reference   | AM07938                              |

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

## Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

### Further evidence required

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

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

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

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the education provider has stated that the person with overall professional responsibility is on the relevant part of the Register, and provided a curriculum vitae. This is a revised standard, and we now require the education provider to show us how they identify a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. Therefore, the visitors require information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.



**Suggested evidence:** Information about the process in place to identify a suitable person to lead the programme and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of Suffolk                        |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time |
| Date submission received | 04 April 2019                                |
| Case reference           | CAS-13941-N1B6Q1                             |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation .....           | 3 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Linda Mutema     | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Rachel Picton    | Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer |
| Ismini Tsikaderi | HCPC executive                         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                   |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                    |
| Profession             | Radiographer                      |
| Modality               | Diagnostic radiographer           |
| First intake           | 01 September 2006                 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 42                          |
| Intakes per year       | 1                                 |
| Assessment reference   | AM07940                           |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| <b>Required documentation</b>  | <b>Submitted</b> |
|--|------------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes              |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes              |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes              |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes              |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years               | Yes              |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years               | Yes              |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Education provider       | University of Suffolk                               |
| Name of programme(s)     | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time |
| Date submission received | 09 April 2019                                       |
| Case reference           | CAS-14016-S9C7G8                                    |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review.....           | 3 |
| Section 5: Visitors' recommendation .....           | 4 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|               |                                   |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| Clare Attrill | Speech and language therapist     |
| Tony Scripps  | Operating department practitioner |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive                    |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name         | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                           |
| Profession             | Operating department practitioner        |
| First intake           | 01 September 2017                        |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10                                 |
| Intakes per year       | 1  |
| Assessment reference   | AM07941                                  |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation   | Submitted |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes       |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes       |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes       |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years               | Yes       |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years               | Yes       |

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

#### Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

#### **2.1 The admissions process 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:** In a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider has made changes to the entry requirements for the programme. From reviewing the information, the visitors noted that the education provider is reducing the UCAS points from 96 to 80 points to appeal to a wider pool of learners. However, there was no evidence provided to document this change. As this information was not provided, the visitors were not able to make a judgement on whether this standard continues to be met. As such, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate the changes made to the admissions process and evidence to support this. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine whether this standard is met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to demonstrate how the changes made to the admissions process give those involved in the admissions process the information they require to make informed judgements.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).



## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of East Anglia                              |
| Name of programme(s)     | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD), Full time |
| Date submission received | 01 April 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13943-H4D1J1                                       |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors' recommendation .....           | 3 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Gary Robinson  | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Sabiha Azmi    | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| John Archibald | HCPC executive                                    |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD) |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                              |
| Profession             | Practitioner psychologist                   |
| Modality               | Clinical psychologist                       |
| First intake           | 01 January 1992                             |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 21                                    |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07942                                     |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| <b>Required documentation</b>  | <b>Submitted</b> |
|--|------------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes              |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes              |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes              |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes              |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years               | Yes              |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years               | Yes              |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of East Anglia                      |
| Name of programme(s)     | DipHE Operating Department Practice, Full time |
| Date submission received | 03 April 2019                                  |
| Case reference           | CAS-13949-V6V6B0                               |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review.....           | 3 |
| Section 5: Visitors' recommendation .....           | 5 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|               |                                   |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| Clare Attrill | Speech and language therapist     |
| Tony Scripps  | Operating department practitioner |
| Shaista Ahmad | HCPC executive                    |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                     |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Programme name         | DipHE Operating Department Practice |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                      |
| Profession             | Operating department practitioner   |
| First intake           | 01 September 2003                   |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20                            |
| Intakes per year       | 1                                   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07948                             |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

## Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation   | Submitted |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes       |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes       |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes       |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years               | Yes       |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years               | Yes       |

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

### Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

### **3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.**

**Reason:** As part of the submission the visitors were provided with the roles and responsibilities of a course director. From reviewing this documentation, the visitors noted that this document was published in 2013, reviewed and updated in 2016. As such, the visitors were not able to establish if the criteria outlined within the document would still apply to the programme. The visitors were also not clear how the education provider would ensure that the person appointed will be suitably qualified on an ongoing basis. Therefore, the visitors require further information about how the education provider ensures that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

**Suggested evidence:** Updated information to demonstrate how the education provider appoints an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

#### **4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.**

**Reason:** As part of the submission the education provider explained that professional issues is taught throughout the programme and is integrated into practice assessment in every module of the programme. To evidence this, the visitors were provided with the student handbook. However, from this information the visitors were not able to establish how learners would understand and able to meet the expectations associated with being a regulated health care professional. The visitors were not able to see how learners would have the opportunity to learn about professional conduct and to demonstrate an understanding of which types of behaviour are appropriate for a professional. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how learners would understand and are able to meet the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Therefore, the education provider must outline how the learning outcomes ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence outlining how the learning outcomes ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour.

#### **4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.**

**Reason:** As part of the submission the education provider explained that learners attend inter-professional learning events in the first and second year of the programme. From reviewing this documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider had submitted a link which detailed information about the Centre for Interprofessional Practice (CIPP). The visitors were not able to see how learners would be able to engage in interprofessional learning on the programme. They were not able to establish how learners were able to learn with and from other professionals and learners in other relevant professions. The visitors were not able to see how learners would be prepared to work with other professionals and across professions for the benefit of service users. As such, the visitors were not able to determine what interprofessional education was available on the programme and whether all learners would have access to this. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how learners will be prepared to work with other professionals and across different professions for the benefit of service users and carers.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to demonstrate that all learners are able to learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

#### **6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.**

**Reason:** As part of the submission the education provider explained that professional issues is taught throughout the programme and is integrated into practice assessment in every module of the programme. To evidence this, the visitors were provided with the

student handbook. However, from this information the visitors were not able to establish how learners are able to demonstrate that they understand the expectations associated with being a regulated health care professional. The visitors were not able to see how learners would be assessed about the expectations associated with being a regulated health care professional if the learners had not had the opportunity to learn about the types of behaviour which are appropriate for a professional. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how learners would be assessed to ensure they are able to meet the standards of conduct, performance and ethics by the time they complete the programme. Therefore, the education provider must outline the assessment throughout the programme that ensures learners are able to demonstrate the expectations of professional behaviour.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence outlining how the assessment throughout the programme ensure learners are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).



## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of East London                              |
| Name of programme(s)     | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy), Full time |
| Date submission received | 01 April 2019  |
| Case reference           | CAS-14033-C0J4B6                                       |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation .....           | 3 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Lincoln Simmonds | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Ruth Baker       | Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist |
| Ismini Tsikaderi | HCPC executive                                    |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy) |
| Mode of study          | FT (Full time)                              |
| Profession             | Practitioner psychologist                   |
| Modality               | Clinical psychologist                       |
| First intake           | 01 September 1991                           |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 31                                    |
| Intakes per year       | 1   |
| Assessment reference   | AM07951                                     |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| <b>Required documentation</b>  | <b>Submitted</b> |
|--|------------------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes              |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes              |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes              |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes              |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years               | Yes              |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years               | Yes              |

### Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of the West of England, Bristol   |
| Name of programme(s)     | Prescribing Principles (Level 3), Part time<br>Prescribing Principles (Level M), Part time<br>Principles of Supplementary Prescribing, Part time |
| Date submission received | 07 February 2019   |
| Case reference           | CAS-14039-K1Z6Z7   |

### Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....             | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                   | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review.....           | 3 |
| Section 5: Visitors' recommendation .....           | 4 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards for prescribing (for education providers) (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|                 |                        |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Rosemary Furner | Independent prescriber |
| Niall Gooch     | HCPC executive         |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                                  |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Programme name         | Prescribing Principles (Level 3) |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)                   |
| Entitlement            | Independent prescribing          |
| First intake           | 01 January 2014                  |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15                         |
| Intakes per year       | 4                                |
| Assessment reference   | AM07966                          |

|                        |                                  |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Programme name         | Prescribing Principles (Level M) |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)                   |
| Entitlement            | Independent prescribing          |
| First intake           | 01 January 2014                  |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15                         |
| Intakes per year       | 4                                |
| Assessment reference   | AM07967                          |

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name         | Principles of Supplementary Prescribing |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)                          |
| Entitlement            | Supplementary prescribing               |
| First intake           | 01 January 2014                         |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 10                                |
| Intakes per year       | 4                                       |
| Assessment reference   | AM07968                                 |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programmes continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation   | Submitted |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes       |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes       |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes       |

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

#### Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

**B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place to deliver an effective programme.**

**Reason:** From the evidence provided, the visitors were aware that the education provider appeared to be planning to admit paramedics to the programme following changes to legislation. They noted that the education provider had not included evidence relating to how they would ensure that paramedics had access to appropriate profession-specific expertise and support. They were therefore not able to determine that the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to show how the education provider will ensure that paramedic learners on the programme are effectively supported by appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## HCPC annual monitoring process report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Education provider       | University of the West of England, Bristol |
| Name of programme(s)     | MA Music Therapy, Part time                |
| Date submission received | 31 January 2019                            |
| Case reference           | CAS-13963-Z4G5B3                           |

### Contents

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....                    | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details.....                          | 2 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....        | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review.....                  | 3 |
| Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation .....                  | 5 |
| Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)..... | 5 |

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 6 of this report.



## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

|                  |                                  |
|------------------|----------------------------------|
| Donald Wetherick | Arts therapist - Music therapist |
| Elaine Streeter  | Arts therapist - Music therapist |
| Eloise O'Connell | HCPC executive                   |

## Section 2: Programme details

|                        |                   |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| Programme name         | MA Music Therapy  |
| Mode of study          | PT (Part time)    |
| Profession             | Arts therapist    |
| Modality               | Music therapist   |
| First intake           | 01 September 2006 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 15          |
| Intakes per year       | 1                 |
| Assessment reference   | AM07973           |

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Required documentation   | Submitted |
|--|-----------|
| HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping | Yes       |
| Internal quality reports from the last two years                         | Yes       |
| External examiner reports from the last two years                        | Yes       |
| Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years           | Yes       |
| Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years               | Yes       |
| Service user and carer involvement from the last two years               | Yes       |

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

#### Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

#### 3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

**Reason:** On review of the documentation, the visitors read in the External Examiner report (2016 -17) for the programme that the external examiner had received incomplete samples of vivas, and had requested then that they provided full vivas for future examples. In the External Examiner report (2017 -18) the examiner said they unable to observe any of the practical / music exams, and no viva presentations were sent to them. The examiner said that both of these 'gaps' have been discussed with the programme leader, and will be addressed in the coming year to ensure the examiner has the whole view of the learners' performance and of the programme's assessment procedures. The visitors read in the report that given the lack of viva presentations, the examiner could not comment on this area, which he notes is key in demonstrating examples from practice-based learning and learner's capacity to integrate theory and practice.

In the education provider's response to the external examiner in October 2018, the visitors read that the programme team have acknowledged this issue and their plans to respond to it. However, the visitors have not seen evidence of how these plans have been implemented or acted on since October 2018. This standard requires the education provider to demonstrate how they continuously gather information on quality and effectiveness, as well as respond to any identified risks, challenges or changes. As the visitors have not seen any evidence regarding how the education provider plans to address these issues raised by the examiner over the last two years, they could not determine how this standard continues to be met. Therefore, the visitors require further information to determine how this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence which shows that actions have been taken to ensure that the external examiner will have access to viva examinations and musical assessments, to ensure to ensure there continues be regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

### **6.3 Assessments must provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.**

**Reason:** On review of the documentation, the visitors read in the External Examiner report (2016 -17) for the programme that the external examiner had received incomplete samples of vivas, and had requested then that they provided full vivas for future examples. In the External Examiner report (2017 -18) the examiner said they unable to observe any of the practical / music exams, and no viva presentations were sent to them. The examiner said that both of these 'gaps' have been discussed with the programme leader, and will be addressed in the coming year to ensure the examiner has the whole view of the learners' performance and of the programme's assessment procedures. The visitors read in the report that given the lack of viva presentations, the examiner could not comment on this area, which he notes is key in demonstrating examples from practice-based learning and learner's capacity to integrate theory and practice.

For this standard, we require the education provider to have appropriate processes in place to make sure that assessments in the programme are objective, fair and reliable. This should include processes for dealing with issues or putting improvements in place where necessary. We do not set how the education provider must do this, but it should involve consideration of external examiners' reports, among other sources. From the information provided, the visitors could not see what actions the programme team have taken in response to these issues raised by the external examiner, where it has been highlighted that the examiner has not been able to view the learners' full performance or the programme's assessment procedures. As the visitors have not seen evidence regarding how the education provider plans to address these issues, or what actions have been put in place, they could not determine how this continues to be met. Therefore, the visitors require further information to determine how this standard continues to be met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence which shows that actions have been taken to ensure that the external examiner will have access to viva examinations and musical assessments, to ensure assessments continue to provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 May 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

In the external examiner's reports submitted for this audit, the visitors read that musical assessments (practical) were observed by the external examiner in 2016 – 17 and were satisfactory, and that observation of these assessments did not occur in 2017 – 18. The education provider indicated in their response to the external examiner that this will be addressed in 2018 – 19. In their response to the additional evidence request for this audit, no further information was provided relating to actions towards ensuring observation of musical assessment since October 2018. However, as the observation was missing for 2017 – 18 only and the education provider has noted this will be addressed in 2018 – 19, the visitors consider this will not impact the standards currently. The education provider should consider submitting evidence about how this has been addressed when they next submit an annual monitoring audit.