

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Association of Clinical Scientists
Name of programme(s)	Certificate of Attainment, Flexible
Date submission received	17 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13715-P9S5T2

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:

Geraldine Hartshorne	Clinical scientist
Patrick Kimmitt	Clinical scientist
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Certificate of Attainment
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Clinical scientist
First intake	1/1/2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 330
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07575

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	The education provider noted that a response to external examiners' report was not required as each observed assessment met the required standard.
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	The education provider provided evidence regarding monitoring of service user and carer involvement in academic year 2017-18 but was unable to provide monitoring in academic year 2016-17.
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The education provider was unable to provide evidence regarding monitoring of practice-based learning in either academic year.

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 04 July 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)	Dip HE Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	18 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13731-P4P6T4

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:

Joanna Jackson	Physiotherapist
Paul Bates	Paramedic
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Dip HE Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07577

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 04 July 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) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Part time
Date submission received	29 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13737-D6T6R1

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:

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 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 129
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07587

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Radiographer
First intake	01 September 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 129
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07588

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: 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 ensure appropriateness of the person who will take on this role. The visitors were unable to determine the process 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. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence on the process to find an appropriate person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates the process 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.

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 04 July 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 education provider in their submission has provided additional evidence to demonstrate that there is a process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners. The visitors understood that the education provider has agreements in place with practice education providers to provide learners with places for practice-based learning. However, the visitors noted that there is limited capacity to offer practice-based learning opportunities to learners. If the education provider continues to struggle securing places for learners in practice-based learning, this will mean that the programme will meet several of the standards around SET 3 and

SET 5 in a different way than the approved programmes and therefore would constitute a change to the way the programme will run.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Birmingham City University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	01 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13739-Q3C9K3

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:

Joanna Jackson	Physiotherapist
Julie Leaper	Dietitian
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07596

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 programme was January 2018, so only documents for the first year have been provided.
External examiner reports from the last two years	No	The first intake for the programme was January 2018, so only documents for the first year have been provided.
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	The first intake for the programme was January 2018, so only documents for the first year have been provided.
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	The first intake for the programme was January 2018, so only documents for the first year have been provided.
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The first intake for the programme was January 2018, so only documents for the first year have been provided.

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 04 July 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)	MSc Physiotherapy, FT (Full time)
Date submission received	01 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13743-Y4Q4K5

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:

Anthony Power	Physiotherapist
Pauline Douglas	Dietitian
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07597

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 programme was January 2018, so only documents for the first year have been provided.
External examiner reports from the last two years	No	The first intake for the programme was January 2018, so only documents for the first year have been provided.
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	The first intake for the programme was January 2018, so only documents for the first year have been provided.
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	The first intake for the programme was January 2018, so only documents for the first year have been provided.
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The first intake for the programme was January 2018, so only documents for the first year have been provided.

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 04 July 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)	DipHE Operating Department Practice, Full time DipHE Operating Department Practice (South West), Full time
Date submission received	11 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13732-Q0R1S7

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:

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 2001
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07586

Programme name	DipHE Operating Department Practice (South West)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07598

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 Curriculum Vitae for the previous and the newly appointed programme leaders. As this standard has been revised, it now requires the education provider to demonstrate how they continue to ensure that the person within this role will be appropriately qualified and experienced and if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. 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 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 to demonstrate how the education provider appoints an appropriate person to lead the programme.

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

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the education provider submitted service level agreements from six NHS trusts, and a clinical placement audit self-assessment. From reviewing this information, the visitors noted that the education provider was able to provide practice-based learning opportunities for learners. However, from this information, they were not able to establish if there were effective processes in place to ensure that all learners on the programme will have access to practice-based learning that meets their learning needs. The visitors were not able to see what formal arrangements were in place to secure practice based learning opportunities for learners. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider would ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners. Therefore, the education provider must outline the process in place to ensure all learners on the programme would have access to practice-based learning opportunities.

Suggested evidence: Information outlining the processes to ensure that all learners on the programme will 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, the education provider submitted a flowchart of how learners would raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. From reviewing this information, the visitors understood that learners would be expected to follow the guidance available within the student handbook. However, the visitors noted that this information was not contained within this document, and so were not able to determine how learners would be able to identify the process they would need to follow to raise a concern about the safety and wellbeing of service users. As such, the visitors were not able to establish if the learners would be aware of the concerns process and the actions they would need to follow to identify and raise a

concern. Therefore, the education provider must outline how they make learners aware of the concerns process.

Suggested evidence: Information outlining how the concerns process is communicated to learners on the programme.

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

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the education provider explained that learners spend sixty per cent of the programme in the practice-based environment where learners have the opportunity to learn with other registered professionals. From reviewing this information, the visitors noted that the learners were able to engage with other registered professionals in the practice-based setting. However, 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 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 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 04 July 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.

From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted in the external examiner report 2017-18 that the teaching staff are currently at full capacity and this is under review due to the size of the current cohort. The programme leader responded to this report

explaining that they are aware of the situation and is reviewing the current staffing situation. 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 Bradford
Name of programme(s)	Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing, Part time Prescribing for Healthcare Professionals, Part time
Date submission received	08 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13748-R7H4R3

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:

Nicola Carey	Independent prescriber
James Pickard	Independent prescriber
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Practice Certificate in Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Supplementary prescribing
First intake	01 February 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07613

Programme name	Prescribing for Healthcare Professionals
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01 February 2014

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07614

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 04 July 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 Bradford
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time
Date submission received	30 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13761-P0D8N7

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 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07615

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 04 July 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 Bradford
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, FT (Full time)
Date submission received	26 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13749-Z8T0C6

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:

Claire Brewis	Occupational therapist
Joanna Goodwin	Occupational therapist
Temilolu Odunaike	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 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07616

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	Yes	
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	During 2016/17 there was not a Service User and Carer lead in the Faculty of Health and thus there is little documentary evidence available to send with this Annual Monitoring Report submission. However data that is available has been sent including reports and documents for 2017/18.

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and

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

Reason: In their submission, the education provider has provided the curriculum vitae of the programme leader who appears to have been in the role since 2004. From this evidence, the visitors were able to see that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme was appropriate. However, this is a new standard, which requires education providers to demonstrate that they now have means of ensuring that, if a programme lead needs to be replaced, a suitable person will fill the role. The visitors were unable to determine from the programme documentation if there is a clear procedure for appointing such a person.

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

Section 5: 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 04 July 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 Bradford
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	01 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13763-COM8S4

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:

Joanna Jackson	Physiotherapist
Paul Bates	Paramedic
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 1997
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07617

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 04 July 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 Bradford
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	30 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13765-X1S7M7

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:

David Comber	Paramedic
Paul Bates	Paramedic
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 August 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07622

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 04 July 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 Bradford
Name of programme(s)	MPhysio Sport and Exercise Medicine, Full time
Date submission received	01 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13753-D5V1W2

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:

Joanna Jackson	Physiotherapist
Paul Bates	Paramedic
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MPhysio Sport and Exercise Medicine
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07627

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	First intake for the programme was September 2017 so documentation only available for academic year 2017-18
External examiner reports from the last two years	No	First intake for the programme was September 2017 so documentation only available for academic year 2017-18
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	First intake for the programme was September 2017 so documentation only available for academic year 2017-18
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	First intake for the programme was September 2017 so documentation only available for academic year 2017-18
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	First intake for the programme was September 2017 so documentation only available for academic year 2017-18

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 04 July 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 Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), FT (Full time) PgDip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), FT (Full time)
Date submission received	24 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13758-N0W6D2

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:

Anthony Power	Physiotherapist
Pauline Douglas	Dietitian
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 August 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07631

Programme name	PgDip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 August 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07632

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 04 July 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)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol), Full time
Date submission received	28 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13770-V8Y2B1

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:

Dawn Blenkin	Occupational therapist
James McManus	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Patrick Armsby	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 1998
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07644

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: In their submission, the education provider has noted that learners on the programme will undertake teaching workshops provided by a range of other professions. They also note that learners from the education provider’s PhD programme (which is taken by a range of professions) learn alongside learners from their clinical

psychology programme. To support these statements, the education provider provided timetables of the taught and research elements of the programme. From reviewing this information and evidence, it seems that the education provider provides the opportunity for learners to learn with and from others. However, the information provided is not clear of the education provider's overall approach to this area, how they ensure that these sessions and opportunities are undertaken by all, or that they are effective. Therefore, the visitors require that the education provider demonstrates how learners will learn with and from other relevant professionals and learners

Suggested evidence: The education provider should show:

- their overall approach to this area, including how they have decided which professions are relevant to clinical psychology, and why the interprofessional activities noted are appropriate; and
- how they will ensure that all learners will be supported to learn with and from professionals and learners from 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 04 July 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 were satisfied that the education provider was ensuring that learners were able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions at threshold level. However, they noted in the additional information response that interprofessional learning opportunities with other learners in the academic setting did not appear to be mandatory, confirming that learners from other relevant PhD programmes "sometimes also attend these lectures and workshops". The visitors recommend that the education provider monitors attendance at these interprofessional sessions to ensure that learners are learning with and from other learners. The education provider may need to adapt its approach in the future if it is no longer ensuring appropriate interprofessional learning with other relevant learners.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	20 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13803-T4N9Z7

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Gordon Pollard	Paramedic
Julie-Anne Lowe	Occupational therapist
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 2000
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07645

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

4.2 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 shown that the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) were to be introduced to learners during the academic & professional development modules and as part of the “placement proficiencies”. However, the visitors were unclear that expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs, were being appropriately covered in the academic setting, they noted SCPEs were not signposted for learners in the module resources or made a prominent part of the module content. The education provider must ensure that the SCPEs are appropriately covered throughout the programme to allow learners to be able to meet these standards on completion of the programme. The education provider must also ensure that learners have the opportunity to understand professional expectations before being in practice and interacting with service users. Therefore, the visitors require further information that demonstrates how the learning outcomes ensure

learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs.

Suggested evidence: The education provider should highlight how they will ensure that the HCPC SCPEs are being appropriately covered in the academic portion of the programme.

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

Reason: The visitors were shown that the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) were to be introduced to learners during the academic & professional development modules and as part of the “placement proficiencies”. The visitors were confident in the SCPEs being covered in the placement proficiency assessment, however were unclear that expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs were being appropriately covered in the academic setting. The visitors could not see that the SCPEs were being assessed at level 4 and were unclear if they were part of the assessment at level 5. The education provider must ensure that the SCPEs are appropriately assessed throughout the programme to allow learners to be able to meet these standards on completion of the programme. The education provider must ensure that learners have the opportunity to demonstrate professional expectations of behaviour before being in practice and interacting with service users. The education provider must demonstrate how the SCPEs will be assessed throughout the programme in both the theory and practice-based parts of the programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must show how they intend to assess learner’s ability to meet the SCPEs throughout 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 04 July 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) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	03 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13808-N0P6S7

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

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

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 April 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07649

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 education provider did not supply Internal Quality monitoring for 2016-17, as they were unable to locate on their systems. Updates on the action plan from this year have been captured within the 2017-18 report.
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes	
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider provided sample module timetables and indicated that learners would be allocated to a range of “different non-ambulance placements”. In the academic setting, the education provider indicated that

modules would be taught by a range of “multi-professional experts”. From the documentation the visitors were able to observe that learners will interact with those in other relevant professions whilst in practice-based learning, and would be taught by multi-professional staff in the academic setting. This standard requires that learners are able to learn with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions. However, the visitors were unable to observe where the learners would learn with and from other learners, not just from other professionals. In order to meet this standard, the education provider must demonstrate how learners have the opportunity to learn with and from other learners in other relevant professions.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which demonstrates how learners are able to learn with and from 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 04 July 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) Paramedic Practice, Full time
Date submission received	03 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13773-M2B8S4

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:

David Comber	Paramedic
Paul Bates	Paramedic
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07650

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	No	The external examiner report has been provided for the 2017 – 2018 academic year. There is no external examiner report for the 2016 – 2017 academic year available. This is because there were learners only on level four of the programme during 2016 – 2017. The education provider does not require level four work to be reviewed by an external examiner, therefore there is no report for that year.
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	As above, the response to external examiner reports is available for the 2017 – 2018 academic year only.
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 04 July 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 Chester
Name of programme(s)	MA Art Therapy, Full time MA Art Therapy, Part time
Date submission received	01 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13812-C8X6X5

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:

John Crossfield	Arts therapist - Art therapist
Jonathan Isserow	Arts therapist - Art therapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA Art Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Art therapist
First intake	01 February 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07651

Programme name	MA Art Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Arts therapist

Modality	Art therapist
First intake	01 February 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07652

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: The visitors were made aware that service users are involved in teaching on two occasions in the programme. The education provider also provided information about how service user's consent is obtained when undertaking practice-based

learning. The visitors did not find information about any other involvement by service users and carers in other aspects of the programme. The visitors therefore consider they have not seen enough evidence of service users and carer's involvement throughout the programme and require further information about how service users and carers contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme, to ensure learners completing the programme are fit to practice.

Suggested evidence: Information about the contribution of service users throughout the programme.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were made aware learners contribute to the programme through the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey as part of the programme's annual evaluation. The visitors could not see any further information how learners are involved in the programme. The visitors therefore consider they have not seen enough evidence of learner's involvement throughout the programme and require further evidence of how the programme asks for, allows and encourages learners to be involved on a regular basis in a meaningful way to develop or improve the programme.

Suggested evidence: Information about how learners contribute to the programme to demonstrate how involving learners has contributed to the quality, effectiveness and continuous improvement of 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 04 July 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 Chester
Name of programme(s)	MSc Nutrition and Dietetics, FT (Full time) Pg Dip Nutrition and Dietetics, FT (Full time)
Date submission received	01 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13814-C4M2K1

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:

Anthony Power	Physiotherapist
Pauline Douglas	Dietitian
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 August 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 16
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07655

Programme name	Pg Dip Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 August 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 16
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07657

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 04 July 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 Chester
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics, FT (Full time)
Date submission received	30 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13775-Y0T8D7

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:

Anthony Power	Physiotherapist
Pauline Douglas	Dietitian
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 16
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07656

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 04 July 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 Exeter
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology, Full time
Date submission received	28 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13852-W4Q9D8

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:

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

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 October 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07711

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: The education provider has indicated in the SETs mapping document that interprofessional learning is currently being developed and that plans are being made with various other departments within the education provider. The education provider also highlighted how other relevant professions are involved in teaching of the programme. However, the education provider produced no information about their plans or decisions that had been made about the design and delivery of interprofessional education with learners in other relevant professions. Therefore, the visitors felt learners were learning from professionals and learners in other relevant professions but were

unable to make a judgement about whether learners are able to learn with professionals and learners in other relevant professions. In order to ensure this standard is met, the education provider must demonstrate how learners are able to learn with, as well as from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

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

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Reason: The education provider has indicated changes to the research protocols to adhere to the data protection act 2018. In reviewing this evidence, the visitors were unable to determine how or if this relates to obtaining consent from service users and learners. In order to ensure this standards continues to be met, the visitors will need to understand if there has been changes to the consent process, or if the education provider's processes remain the same. If the process has been changed, the visitors will need to understand that it is effective it is for obtaining appropriate consent.

Suggested evidence: Confirmation about whether the consent policy for service users and learners has been adapted as a result of the data protection act 2018. If the policy has been adapted, information that demonstrates that the process is effective.

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 04 July 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 Exeter
Name of programme(s)	Educational, Child and Community Psychology (D.Ed.Psy), Full time
Date submission received	21 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13795-W1N6F9

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:

Lisa Marks Woolfson	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Educational, Child and Community Psychology (D.Ed.Psy)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Educational psychologist
First intake	01 January 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07712

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed evidence provided relating to learning from other professions, including a diagram laying out the presentations delivered by other relevant professionals. Apart from an email planning a session with occupational therapists for year one learners, it was not clear to the visitors where learning with other professions was included in the programme. The mapping document referred to the education provider having a history of providing learning opportunities alongside other professional groups, but this evidence did not appear to have been included in the submission. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether learners were able to learn with professionals and learners in other relevant professions, and how the education provider planned such activities.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating that learners are able to learn with professionals and learners in other relevant professions, and how this interprofessional education is planned.

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 04 July 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 Exeter
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Medical Imaging (Diagnostic Radiography), Full time
Date submission received	02 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13853-L5D1N2

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:

Caroline Sykes	Speech and language therapist
Mark Widdowfield	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Medical Imaging (Diagnostic Radiography)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Diagnostic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07713

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: From reviewing the evidence provided for this standard, the visitors noted the person specification and main responsibilities for the senior lecturer undertaking the professional lead role. However, the responsibilities mentioned were generic responsibilities, and did not specify the professional duties expected to be carried out by the person holding overall professional responsibility. Due to this, the visitors were

unable to determine if this standard has been met. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate what responsibilities are expected from the senior lecturer that is appointed as the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme.

Suggested evidence: Information regarding what are the professional responsibilities expected from the senior lecturer, who undertakes professional lead responsibility.

3.16 There must be thorough and effective processes in place for ensuring the ongoing suitability of learners' conduct, character and health.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the 'ToR - CMH Health & Conduct Committee' document and a weblink provided. From their review, the visitors could not find any information regarding the process in place to continuously assess the suitability of learners' conduct, character and health. There was also no information regarding the process of how to deal with any concerns about learners. Therefore, the visitors could not determine if this standard has been met.

Suggested evidence: Information or relevant document demonstrating the process in place for ensuring the ongoing suitability of learners' conduct, character and health

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: From reviewing the evidence including the weblink provided for this standard, the visitors noted there is a report form to be filled out to report any serious incident. There was also mention of guidance to fill out the form and whom it is sent to, but there was no information regarding what policy is in place for reviewing any concerns and the follow up process. As such, the visitors could not determine if this standard has been met

Suggested evidence: Process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of learners. The process must also explain how concerns raised get looked at and how is this conveyed to 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 visitors were directed to the module amendments document, which highlighted the proposed assessment changes. From reviewing the evidence, it was not clear how clinical assessments are assessed. The evidence gave an overview of assessment changes, but they were not linked to any specific modules. As such, the visitors could not determine how learners will be able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs).

Suggested evidence: Clarity regarding which assessment changes are linked to which specific modules, and how will this ensure learners are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the 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 04 July 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) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	20 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13799-Y3W2P2

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:

David Comber	Paramedic
Julie Leaper	Dietitian
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 75
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07722

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	The East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust were unable to complete the Practice Placement Audits in the area used by the education provider of Hertfordshire in 2017 due to long term sickness of the Link lecturer. In 2018 the sudden death of the manager leading practice placement in the area the audit for Letchworth was not carried out. The education provider said they have instigated the audit process for 2019 and it is being carried out in all areas.
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: For this standard, the education provider has said that the professional lead and associate dean are working with the education provider and NHS Trusts legal department to write Memorandums of Understanding. The education provider has said there are long practice placement agreements in place. The education provider referred to the NHS Ambulance Service Trust audits as evidence for this standard.

This is a revised standard, which is about the processes the education provider has in place to make sure that all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning. From the information provided, the visitors could not see information about a process in place which ensures this. For example, the visitors have not seen how the education provider collaborates with the practice education providers on a regular basis to ensure continuing availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners. This includes learners currently on the programme and a plan for future learners. The visitors could not see from the audit information how the education provider plans and monitors availability and capacity, or how they address any issues or concerns in this area. Therefore, the visitors require further information to determine whether this standard is met.

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

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider referred to the Programme Handbook, which includes a section on raising and escalating concerns during practice-based learning. The section includes a statement about the responsibilities of learners to raise any concerns that they might have about the safety and wellbeing of service users which on practice-based learning. The section goes on to note who these concerns should be raised to, and provides the link to the education provider policies. The section also note that learners should follow the practice education providers raising and escalation concerns processes.

From the information provided, the visitors could not determine how learners would be given information which would help them to recognise situations where service users may be at risk. This standard is about helping learners to recognise situations where service users may be at risk, supporting them in raising any concerns and making sure action is taken in response to those concerns. It is not clear from the information provided how learners would be enabled to raise concerns, should they have any. The visitors could not see a clear process, specific to the safety and wellbeing of service users, which the learners would follow while on the programme. The visitors require further information to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Further information about the 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 04 July 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.

For the annual monitoring audit we now require the education provider to submit evidence of their monitoring of practice-based learning over the last two years. The education provider reported that due to extenuating circumstances, the audit for practice-based learning in some areas were not carried out. The education provider highlighted that they have instigated the audit process for 2019, which is being carried out in all areas. The education provider should consider providing evidence of this in their next annual monitoring audit, to show that the gaps have been addressed. The visitors who review the next annual monitoring audit will therefore be able to determine the standards in relation to ongoing monitoring of practice-based learning continue to be met.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Name of programme(s)	MA Art Therapy, Full time MA Art Therapy, Part time
Date submission received	05 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13802-Q4N1P5

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:

John Crossfield	Arts therapist - Art therapist
Jonathan Isserow	Arts therapist - Art therapist
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA Art Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Art therapist
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07726

Programme name	MA Art Therapy
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Arts therapist
Modality	Art therapist
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07727

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.

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

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors were made aware the education provider had not made changes to the way they met this standard. However, for our annual monitoring requirements, education providers now need to submit information about service user and carer involvement for the previous two academic years. The visitors noted that service users are involved in the interview process for applicants. As part of the evidence of service user involvement, the education provider said two service users had each delivered a lecture to learners on the programme. The education provider also supplied an invite to an exhibition, but did not demonstrate how service users were involved. The visitors were therefore unclear how service users' involvement is appropriate to the programmes and how it has contributed to governing and improving the programmes. The visitors were also unclear how service users and carers are supported so that they are appropriately involved and how their involvement was planned, monitored and evaluated.

Suggested evidence: Information to show how service users and carers contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of a 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 04 July 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Hull
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	20 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13876-Q3K4G3

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.....	7
Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)	7

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:

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

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07739

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	As this is a new programme approved for a first intake in September 2018 only 1 year of reports are available
External examiner reports from the last two years	No	As this is a new programme approved for a first intake in September 2018 only 1 year of reports are available
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	As this is a new programme approved for a first intake in September 2018 only 1 year of reports are available
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	As this is a new programme approved for a first intake in September 2018 only 1 year of reports are available
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	As this is a new programme approved for a first intake in September 2018 only 1 year of reports are available

Following the approval process undertaken in the 2016-17 academic year, the Education and Training Committee approved this programme, but required the education provider to provide further evidence of:

- the programme staff involved with the delivery of the programme and information regarding their role and their teaching and learning responsibilities on the programme;
- the mechanisms in place to support the professional development of paramedic programme staff with regards to their teaching and learning responsibilities for the programme;
- the progress made by paramedic programme staff to achieve formal teaching qualifications;
- the programme specific training carried out which ensures all practice educators understand the requirements for supporting and assessing students on the programme and how attendance at such training is monitored;
- the attendance requirements in place for the programme, how these are communicated to students and the mechanisms in place to monitor this; and,

- the assessment regulations which specify the requirement for an external examiner for the programme to be a registered paramedic.

The visitors have considered this information as part of this audit, and have used it to form their judgements about whether the programme continues to meet the SETs.

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 visitors were shown the minutes from the “Practice Forum Meeting” as evidence for standards that relate to placement and related resourcing. In this document the visitors noted that the education provider had acknowledged various issues that effected practice-based learning. Firstly, they indicated they were struggling to source the required capacity of placements for learners. Secondly, they indicated that there was a problem with resourcing practice-based staff. They indicated there was a small uptake, staff were not given the appropriate time from their employers and there was a high attrition rate for these staff. The visitors considered that these issues with placement resources could affect the sustainability of the programme as the future resourcing in this area was not made clear. To be sure that this standard continues to be met, the education provider must show that their partner organisations are committed to providing adequate resources for practice-based learning and that the potential risks raised in the practice forum meeting are being effectively managed.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must show formalised plans with partner organisations that confirm the adequate capacity and staffing for practice-based learning.

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 provided minutes of practice forum meeting to highlight its ability to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners. The visitors found the minutes to be related to a range of professions and suggest there is an issue with the availability of practice-based learning capacity. From the information provided, it was not clear how the education provider was dealing with these issues. Therefore, the visitors were not clear that there is a clear and effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all

learners, including addressing any issues when they occur. To be sure that this standard is met, the education provider must show formalised plans that ensure the capacity for the practice-based learning for the entire cohort.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must show how it is ensuring the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provider highlighted in the evidence for this standard that learners are being involved as participants for research, and as ambassadors for interviews for prospective learners. The visitors considered that although this involvement was not academic, it did not highlight how learners were contributing to the quality, effectiveness and continuous improvement of the programme. The education provider also highlighted that a student representative sits on the “Programme Management Team”, however the visitors were not provided any documentation to evidence this and so could not judge the level of this involvement. To be sure that this standard is met, the education provider must provide information that demonstrates that the experience of learners is central to the quality and effectiveness of the programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must show how it involves learners in improving 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 visitors noted from the documentation that the programme has 3 full-time equivalent members of staff. The visitors were unclear how these members of staff were adequate for the cohort of 40 learners. The visitors could not determine that the staff were solely involved in teaching or they covered administrative tasks, therefore they were unable to judge if there were appropriate numbers of staff to deliver the programme effectively. To be sure that this standard continues to be met, the education provider must highlight all members of staff that support the programme, including potential non-profession specific members of the teaching staff, and show how their staff team is able to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider should provide documentation that highlights how there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

3.11 An effective programme must be in place to ensure the continuing professional and academic development of educators, appropriate to their role in the programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider has provided an educational certificate for a member of staff, and indicated in the mapping document that other members of staff are undertaking formal teaching qualifications. It is clear to the visitors from the documentation that the education provider has made progress with the academic development for educators with the programme of teaching qualifications. However, the visitors were unable to view any plans for the professional aspect of their development. The standard requires that educators have access to both professional and academic development programmes. To be sure that this standard continues to be

met, the education provider must ensure that educators are able to keep their professional development up to date in order to deliver the programme effectively.

Suggested evidence: The education provider should show how they have an effective process in place to ensure educators are able to access continuing professional and academic development.

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: From the information provided, the visitors noted that the “HCPC Code of Conduct” was included in the indicative module content for “Clinical practice education 1”. The visitors were unsure that this included all of the standards for conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs), and how they would be covered throughout the programme. The visitors need to understand how learners are being taught all of the SCPEs and how this teaching is being carried out through the programme, in order for this standard to be met. The education provider must show how the SCPEs are being delivered throughout the programme.

Suggested evidence: Information that shows how they will ensure the SCPEs are being taught in the academic setting and how this teaching is carried out through the programme

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

Reason: In the documentation the education provider indicated that learners would have the opportunity to work in “multi-disciplinary teams” whilst on placement, and indicated that interprofessional learning will take place in the academic setting during the 2nd and 3rd years. However, the visitors could not see evidence of the opportunities for inter-professional learning to take place in the academic setting. The standard requires that learners have the opportunity to learn with and from professionals and learners. The visitors were not clear that learners were able to learn with and from learners from other professions. The education provider must show how it will incorporate interprofessional learning between learners in the academic setting, to ensure that this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: The education must provide documentation to show how learners will be able to learn with and from learners in other relevant professions.

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

Reason: The visitors were shown the minutes from the “Practice Forum Meeting” as evidence for standards that relate to placement and related resourcing. In this document the visitors noted that the education provider had acknowledged various issues that affected practice-based learning. Firstly, they indicated they were struggling to source the required capacity of placements for learners. Secondly, they indicated that there was a problem with resourcing practice-based staff. They indicated there was limited uptake, staff were not given the appropriate time from their employers and there was a high attrition rate for these staff. The visitors were therefore unsure how the

education provider was ensuring there would be an adequate number of staff involved in practice-based learning. In order to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met, the education provider must show how they intend to provide appropriate numbers of staff for practice-based learning. .

Suggested evidence: The education provider must show how they ensure the staff involved in practice-based learning are appropriately qualified and experienced. This evidence could include information that partner organisations are committed to providing adequate resources for practice-based learning and that the potential risks raised in the practice forum meeting are being effectively managed.

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 visitors observed a mention of the “HCPC Code of Conduct” in the indicative module content for “Clinical practice education 1”. The visitors were unsure that this included all of the standards for conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) and how they would be covered throughout the programme. The visitors need to understand how the SCPEs are being assessed and how this assessment is being carried out through the programme, in order for this standard to be met. The learners must be able to demonstrate that they are able to meet these standards in order to practice effectively and safely. The education provider must show how the SCPEs are being assessed throughout the programme.

Suggested evidence: Information that shows how expectations of professional conduct, including the SCPEs are assessed through 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 04 July 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 considering the additional evidence for SET 3.8 the visitors noted that learners do have the opportunity for involvement and the education provider clearly has a process

to allow learners to be involved. However, the visitors noted from the minutes that there was limited involvement from the paramedic programme compared to other courses in the student-staff forum. The visitors understand that the education provider has provided the opportunity and cannot insist on attendance but noted that there could be the potential for the standard to not be met in the future if there continues to be limited involvement from the paramedic course in the student-staff forums. Therefore, the visitors recommend that learner participation in student-staff forums be considered in future assessments to ensure the standards continue to be met.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Institute of Biomedical Science
Name of programme(s)	Clinical Scientist Certificate of Attainment (Experiential Route), Flexible
Date submission received	11 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13881-X5B9P4

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:

Geraldine Hartshorne	Clinical scientist
Ruth Ashbee	Clinical scientist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Clinical Scientist Certificate of Attainment (Experiential Route)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Clinical scientist
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07745

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	N/A	
External examiner reports from the last two years	No	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	At the time of approval, it was agreed by the HCPC that the programme would not have to meet SET 5.
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The programme was not approved until December 2017, and has not yet admitted any candidates, so has not been able to

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 04 July 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	King's College London
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	19 February 2019
Case reference	CAS-13877-J5N2P4

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) Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2002
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07747

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 referred the visitors to a KCL-Programme review procedures 2 document and a Sample JD 2017 Dietitian. From their review of the KCL-Programme review procedures 2 document, the visitors were unable to locate information relating to how the education provider ensures there is an appropriately qualified and experienced person holding overall professional

responsibility for the programme. The link from the Sample JD 2017 Dietitian document, took the visitors to an online job description for a Lecturer in Nutrition & Dietetics. They were unsure whether this would be the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. 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.

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 referred the visitors to a Raising Concerns Flow Chart and the Placement 2 Student Handbook. From their review of the Raising Concerns Flow Chart, the visitors noted the flow chart can commence with a student concern, though it does not outline what type of concern this might be. For example, it was unclear whether this could be a learner concern about a placement educator or a safety concern about the wellbeing of a service user.

The Placement 2 Student Handbook includes an Induction Checklist which outlines key issues relating to the practice-based learning that will be communicated in the first couple of days. One of the items to be covered is the Safeguarding policy but there is no further explanation in this document about what this means or should cover. The visitors were therefore unclear how learners are able to recognise the type of situations where service users may be at risk, how they are supported in raising any concerns and what action may be taken in response to any concerns. The visitors therefore require evidence of an effective process which ensures learners are made aware of the process and are supported when raising concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users'.

Suggested evidence: Documentation which demonstrates an effective process to support and enable learners when raising 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 04 July 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 Dietetics, Full time Pg Dip Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	24 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13880-K0C3H9

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Joanna Jackson	Physiotherapist
Julie Leaper	Dietitian
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 9
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07749

Programme name	Pg Dip Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2003

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 7
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07751

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: The visitors were shown sample job descriptions for lecturer grade six and lecturer grade seven as well as a certificate from the British Dietetic Association (BDA) in order to evidence this standard. The visitors were able to determine how lecturers are

appointed and how the education provider ensures they are appropriately qualified and experienced. The visitors also could not see evidence for the person holding overall professional responsibility. In particular, the visitors did not receive any evidence which articulates the requirements for fulfilling this role, or what the appointment process for this role would be. This standard requires the education provider to demonstrate how they ensure that the individual fulfilling this role is suitably qualified and experienced. The education provider must therefore provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified, experienced and from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are appropriate.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that the education provider ensures 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.

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 education provider provided their Raising Concerns Process Flowchart and Placement Handbook induction checklist in order to evidence this standard. The flowchart made no mention of service users and the visitors understood the flowchart to be about learner's personal concerns rather than concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The education provider referred to page 10 and 11 in the Placement Handbook induction checklist, however the document did not include pages 10 or 11, and the visitors found no reference in the document about raising concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. From the information provided, the visitors were unable to determine what process is in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, or where learners would find this information. The visitors require further information which demonstrates the education provider has a clear and effective process in place for learners to raise concerns about service user's safety and wellbeing.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the process for learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. This should include information about how learners are supported and enabled to recognise situations where service users are 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 04 July 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 Lincoln
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy), Full time
Date submission received	25 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13886-F6G6F2

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 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07758

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

As a result of a concern raised about the programme, we also received information from the education provider to demonstrate how they have made changes to ensure consistency in the ownership, application, and communication of the following policies and procedures:

- a) Complaints processes;
- b) Fitness to practise procedures;
- c) Conduct and discipline; and
- d) Trainees with disabilities.

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.

3.12 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: As part of this annual monitoring audit, the education provider was required to submit evidence which demonstrates how they have made changes to ensure

consistency in the communication of several policies and procedures. The programme is managed as one, together with University of Nottingham's Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy) programme. The visitors were made aware of updates to the programme handbook in regards to the Joint Regulations, which contain the complaints process, fitness to practice procedures, and conduct and discipline process. However, the visitors were made aware in order to access the policies, learners had to follow several stages. Learners were advised by email they needed to access appendix D1. On accessing appendix D1, learners were provided with a number of weblinks, the one they had to access was dependent on which academic year they started. The weblinks took learners to the Joint Regulations, of which the policies could be found as appendices. The visitors consider the policies to not be easily accessible and readily available to learners to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. Therefore, they require further information to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Information on how learners are able to easily access the complaints, fitness to practice and conduct and discipline policies within the Joint Regulations.

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

Reason: The visitors were made aware that to access disability services, the Joint Regulations say learners can go to either education provider, which was not dependent on a learner's home institution. However, the visitors were unclear from the evidence provided if decisions made by one education provider would be recognised and acted upon by the other. The visitors therefore consider information given to learners to not be clear, and that learners may not be supported as required through the programme. The visitors therefore require further information about how the education provider will ensure its Trainee with Disabilities policy provides clear information for both learners and educators, and that both institutions will act upon adjustments as identified.

Suggested evidence: Information to ensure the Trainee with Disabilities policy provides clear information for learners and educators.

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 04 July 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 Lincoln
Name of programme(s)	Postgraduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time Practice Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing, Part time
Date submission received	31 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13823-Q5W6M7

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:

Nicholas Haddington	Independent prescriber
Rosemary Furner	Independent prescriber
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01/08/2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07759

Programme name	Practice Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Independent prescribing
First intake	01/08/2017

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM07760

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 04 July 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 Lincoln
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration), FT (Full time)
Date submission received	26 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13887-X5D1R0

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:

Anthony Power	Physiotherapist
Pauline Douglas	Dietitian
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07761

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 programme was January 2018, so only documents for the first year have been provided.
External examiner reports from the last two years	No	The first intake for the programme was January 2018, so only documents for the first year have been provided.
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	The first intake for the programme was January 2018, so only documents for the first year have been provided.
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	The first intake for the programme was January 2018, so only documents for the first year have been provided.
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The first intake for the programme was January 2018, so only documents for the first year have been provided.

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 04 July 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)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin.Psychol), Full time
Date submission received	29 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13890-W5G0Q9

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

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 (D.Clin.Psychol)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Clinical psychologist
First intake	01 January 1993
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 24
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07763

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.

3.12 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: As part of the documentation to meet this standard, the visitors were made aware the education provider had relocated their resource room, and bought new computers and other equipment. However, the visitors were unclear as to the impact of the move and the additional equipment. Therefore, the visitors could not determine how the resources will be used and how effective and accessible they are for learners and educators to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Information on how the resources will be used and how effective and accessible they are for learners and educators.

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 04 July 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)	BSc (Hons) Dietetics and Nutrition, Full time BSc (Hons) Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	12 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13833-V6N6L6

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:

Joanna Jackson	Physiotherapist
Julie Leaper	Dietitian
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics and Nutrition
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07779

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian

First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07784

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	The University Quality Enhancement Unit does not provide a formal response to the external examiner.
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 04 July 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)	MSc Dietetics and Nutrition, Full time Post Graduate Diploma Dietetics and Nutrition (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	08 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13931-D2T7G4

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Joanna Jackson	Physiotherapist
Julie Leaper	Dietitian
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Dietetics and Nutrition
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07780

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma Dietetics and Nutrition (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)

Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07781

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	The University Quality Enhancement Unit does not provide a formal response to the external examiner. The programme evaluation meeting is the mechanism by which the education provider discusses the external examiners feedback and responds at the meeting. Copies of the minutes were included within the submission.
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 04 July 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), FT (Full time)
Date submission received	24 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13846-R7K1R2

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:

Anthony Power	Physiotherapist
Pauline Douglas	Dietitian
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 14
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07800

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 04 July 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 Applied Educational Psychology, Full time
Date submission received	04 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13952-J7W5H5

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 Applied Educational Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Educational psychologist
First intake	01 September 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07811

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.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Reason: For this annual monitoring audit, we now require the education provider to submit evidence of their monitoring of practice-based learning for the last two academic years. The visitors saw some evidence of how the education provider monitor’s learners on practice-based learning and how they take feedback from learners and practice educators. However, the visitors could not see any information about how they use feedback to identify areas of development or action plans. As part of monitoring of practice-based learning we expect education provider’s to be able to demonstrate outcomes of practice-based learning quality monitoring activity, feedback from stakeholders, and how they identity areas for development and any action plans. The visitors could not see evidence of this in the submission. Therefore, the visitors could not determine that the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for ensuring the quality of practice-based learning. The visitors require further evidence of

monitoring of practice-based learning for the last two years to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence of monitoring of practice-based learning in the last years, including how the education provider uses feedback to identify areas of development or action plans.

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 04 July 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Nottingham
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy), Full time
Date submission received	04 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13959-M8H4F0

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 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 19
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07817

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

As a result of a concern raised about the programme, we also received information from the education provider to demonstrate how they have made changes to ensure consistency in the ownership, application, and communication of the following policies and procedures:

- a) Complaints processes;
- b) Fitness to practise procedures;
- c) Conduct and discipline; and
- d) Trainees with disabilities.

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.

3.12 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: As part of this annual monitoring audit, the education provider was required to submit evidence which demonstrates how they have made changes to ensure

consistency in the communication of several policies and procedures. The programme is managed as one, together with University of Lincoln's Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy) programme. The visitors were made aware of updates to the programme handbook in regards to the Joint Regulations, which contain the complaints process, fitness to practice procedures, and conduct and discipline process. However, the visitors were made aware in order to access the policies, learners had to follow several stages. Learners were advised by email they needed to access appendix D1. On accessing appendix D1, learners were provided with a number of weblinks, the one they had to access was dependent on which academic year they started. The weblinks took learners to the Joint Regulations, of which the policies could be found as appendices. The visitors consider the policies to not be easily accessible and readily available to learners to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. Therefore, they require further information to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Information on how learners are able to easily access the complaints, fitness to practice and conduct and discipline policies within the Joint Regulations.

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

Reason: The visitors were made aware that to access disability services, the Joint Regulations say learners can go to either education provider, which was not dependent on a learner's home institution. However, the visitors were unclear from the evidence provided if decisions made by one education provider would be recognised and acted upon by the other. The visitors therefore consider information given to learners to not be clear, and that learners may not be supported as required through the programme. The visitors therefore require further information about how the education provider will ensure its Trainee with Disabilities policy provides clear information for both learners and educators, and that both institutions will act upon adjustments as identified.

Suggested evidence: Information to ensure the Trainee with Disabilities policy provides clear information for learners and educators.

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 04 July 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	New School of Psychotherapy and Counselling and Middlesex University
Name of programme(s)	Doctorate in Counselling Psychology and Psychotherapy by Professional Studies (DCPsych), Full time
Date submission received	29 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13964-F2R7S1

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:

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

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Doctorate in Counselling Psychology and Psychotherapy by Professional Studies (DCPsych)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 16
Intakes per year	3
Assessment reference	AM07825

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 refers to the Clinical Handbook. Upon reviewing the document, the visitors saw a flowchart of how placements are approved and which outlines that learners either need to choose a placement from a list or find their own placements. While the Clinical Handbook makes

reference to the process of approving placements for learners, it does not provide detail about the availability of placements or the areas in which they might be possible. In addition, there is no information on what happens if learners cannot find a placement. The visitors therefore require further evidence which demonstrates the process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which outlines the process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning, including what should happen if learners are unable to source their own practice-based learning.

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 refers to page 5 of the Clinical Handbook. This page outlines how clinical supervision works, including the expectations of learners and supervisors. However, the visitors could not identify from this, a process to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors located a brief reference to a process in the External Supervisor / Change of Placement Supervisor Form. This form states that should there be any concerns about issues of safeguarding and risk concerning the client's wellbeing, the placement and the relevant services should be contacted as soon as possible. The standards of education and training mapping document states how learners are supported in their clinical work through the supervisory arrangements at the practice-based learning and education provider. From this information, the visitors were unclear of the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users and how learners are aware of this. This standard requires the education provider to ensure that learners are able to recognise situations where service users may be at risk, support them in raising any concerns and ensure action is taken in response to those concerns. From the evidence provided the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures this. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to determine how this standard is met.

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

4.9 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 standards of education and training mapping document makes reference to Appendix 3 of the Programme Handbook. Appendix 3 contains the module narratives for the programme. The mapping document also states that learners will learn from other professionals through their placement work and shared modules with other professions, such as psychotherapy and counselling. However the visitors could not easily identify from the module narratives and the mapping document, when and where this learning would take place. This standard requires that learners are able to work with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions for the benefit of service users and carers. However, from Appendix 3, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures this. The visitors therefore require further evidence which demonstrates how learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which demonstrates how the education provider ensures learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Section 5: 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 04 July 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)	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	30 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13982-X3H1M0

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:

Jane Grant	Occupational therapist
Dawn Blenkin	Occupational therapist
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07827

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 04 July 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)	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time
Date submission received	30 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13866-C1Z1C2

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:

Joanna Jackson	Physiotherapist
Paul Bates	Paramedic
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07828

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 04 July 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Name of programme(s)	BSc Paramedic Science, Full time BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time BSc Paramedic Science, Flexible BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Flexible
Date submission received	01 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13966-W7M6P8

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 Comber	Paramedic
Julie Leaper	Dietitian
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 18
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07830

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2016

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 18
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07831

Programme name	BSc Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 17
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07832

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 17
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07836

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 person with overall professional responsibility has previously been agreed via the major change process, 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.

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider said that the Practice Education Unit offers learners clear advice on their obligation to and the process for raising and escalating concerns. The education provider said that reminders are also provided to learners about their obligations to raise any concerns throughout the programme. The education provider also notes other areas where guidance and support on this area are offered. From the information provided, the visitors could not see evidence of a clear process in place for learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors could also not see evidence of how learners are prepared and supported to recognise situations where service users may be at risk. Therefore, the visitors require further information to determine whether this standard is met.

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

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 04 July 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Portsmouth
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, Full time
Date submission received	12 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13970-M2H1J9

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:

Caroline Sykes	Speech and language therapist
Mark Widdowfield	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Rabie Sultan	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 1995
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 55
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07845

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 04 July 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Portsmouth
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	26 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13971-T9N2Q9

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:

David Comber	Paramedic
Paul Bates	Paramedic
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07847

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 04 July 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Portsmouth
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time
Date submission received	02 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13889-M8R4Q7

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:

Paul Jeffrey	Operating department practitioner
David Bevan	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	1/8/2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07848

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	The education provider provided response to external examiners' report for the academic year 2017-18, however they were unable to locate the response to external examiners' report at present on their record system due to the replacement of their Associate Head of Education.
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 04 July 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 Educational, Child and Adolescent Psychology (DECAP), Full time
Date submission received	04 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13983-H5H7G5

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 Educational, Child and Adolescent Psychology (DECAP)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Educational psychologist
First intake	01 January 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07853

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.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Reason: For this annual monitoring audit, we now require the education provider to submit evidence of their monitoring of practice-based learning for the last two academic years. The visitors saw some evidence of how the education provider monitors practice-based learning. However, the visitors could not see any information about how they use feedback to identify areas of development or action plans. As part of monitoring of practice-based learning we expect the education provider to be able to demonstrate outcomes of practice-based learning quality monitoring activity, feedback from stakeholders, and how they identify areas for development and any action plans. The visitors could not see evidence of this in the submission. Therefore, the visitors could

not determine that the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for ensuring the quality of practice-based learning. The visitors require further evidence of monitoring of practice-based learning for the last two years to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence of monitoring of practice-based learning in the last years, including how the education provider uses feedback to identify areas of development or action plans.

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 04 July 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 Reading
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	30 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13984-T4H4N4

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.

Document control			
Document version	1.0.1	Document owner	Operations Team
Last updated	14 November 2017	Last reviewed	August 2017

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:

Caroline Sykes	Speech and language therapist
Mark Widdowfield	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Rabie Sultan	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 32
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07855

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 04 July 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 Reading
Name of programme(s)	MSc Speech and Language Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	09 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13894-R5W2D3

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:

Caroline Sykes	Speech and language therapist
Mark Widdowfield	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 January 2001
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 12
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07856

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 04 July 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) Prosthetics and Orthotics, Full time
Date submission received	05 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13895-V4H7V4

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:

Hazel Currie	Prosthetist / orthotist
Fiona McCullough	Dietitian
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Prosthetist / orthotist
First intake	01 January 1998
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07858

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 04 July 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)	MSc Podiatry, Full time
Date submission received	27 March 2019
Case reference	CAS-13901-R0W2J5

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	MSc Podiatry
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Chiropodist / podiatrist
First intake	01 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07869

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.

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 secures both practice-based learning in both the public and private sector. However, the visitors did not see information on the procedure for securing 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.

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

Reason: From the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors were made aware practice-based learning is undertaken on a multidisciplinary experience. The education provider supplied a module descriptor as evidence of how learners learn with and from professionals and learners on other relevant professions. However, on a review of the documentation, the visitors were unable to find information to fully determine whether and how learners currently engage with other professionals and across professions throughout the entire programme.

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

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 04 July 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 and Kingston University
Validating body	St George's, University of London
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time
Date submission received	12 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13990-G4V9K9

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).....	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:

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	FT (Full time)
Profession	Occupational therapist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07870

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 BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy was September 2017 so full reports were only available for the 2017-2018 academic year.
External examiner reports from the last two years	No	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	

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 made reference to “Appendix 1” in the SETs mapping document that detailed “Recruitment process, including job description and person specification” to evidence this standard. However, the visitors were not provided with this document so were unable to make a judgement that the standard was being met.

Prior to the assessment day, the education provider was notified that appendix 1 had been omitted from the submission. In reply to this they requested that we refer to a major change that was submitted on 7 February 2018. The visitors did not refer to this, as the major change does not relate to the revised SETs. This revised standard is such that the HCPC visitors no longer need to make a judgement about the suitability of the person in this role at this time, but rather need to make a judgement that the education provider is able to ensure that the person in this role is appropriately qualified and experienced. The education provider has not provided evidence that is sufficient to meet this standard. Therefore, the education provider must show how they ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced on an ongoing basis.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must show how they make sure the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced on an ongoing basis.

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 minutes of London and South East Area Partnership for Placements (LSEAPP) actions and decision document. The visitors were unable to determine from the minutes of this meeting that all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning as it was not explicitly disclosed in the minutes. To meet this standard we would expect the education provider to show how they ensure there is sufficient practice-based learning opportunity for all learners throughout the programme. From the LSEAPP minutes the visitors were unable to judge the standard has been met and therefore require a clear demonstration of how the education provider ensures the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of the education provider's process to ensure there is sufficient capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were shown an agenda for the course committee. Within this agenda there is a mention of the "student staff consultative committee" that feeds advice and guidance to the course committee. It was unclear to the visitors how the student staff consultative committee is organised and what areas they are specifically asked for feedback on. As the information in the agenda was implicit about the student staff consultative committee, the visitors were unable to judge that learners were involved in the continuous development of the programme in a meaningful way. In order to demonstrate that this standard is met, the education provider must explicitly show how learner's experiences are taken into account for the improvement and development of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Documentary evidence of how learners are involved in the continuous development of the programme.

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

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider has provided module descriptors that detail the module content for the programme. The visitors noted the inclusion of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) in the reading list for practice-based modules. However, from the information provided, the visitors could not see that the SCPEs were being introduced to learners or covered in the academic setting. The visitors could not see the SCPEs being taught in academic modules, and were not sure if the reading list for the practice-based module would be compulsory. It was not clear to the visitors that the education provider was making sure that learners have the opportunity to learn and understand the SCPEs through the learning outcomes. The education provider must show how learners will have the opportunity to learn and understand and are able to meet expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs through the programme.

Suggested evidence: The education must show how the learning outcomes reflect the expectations of professional behaviours, including the 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 To evidence this standard the education provider has provided module descriptors that detail the module content for the programme. The visitors noted the inclusion of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) in the reading list for practice-based modules. The visitors could not see that the SCPEs were being introduced to learners in an academic setting, and consequently not being assessed in an academic setting. This standard requires the education provider to show that the SCPEs are assessed in both the academic and practice-based setting. It was not clear to the visitors that the education provider was making sure that learners have the opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of the SCPEs through assessment in the academic setting. The education provider must show how learners will have the opportunity to demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs, in both the theory and practice-based part of the programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must show how they will assess the SCPEs in the theory based parts of 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 04 July 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 education provider uses the First Year Module Interprofessional Foundation Programme (page 13 of the module directory) as evidence for this SET. There is clearly some discussion in this module around professional behaviour. Although the SCPEs are not specifically stated the nature of these discussions would by default lead to the SCPEs being discussed. The visitors felt this approach did meet the standards at a threshold level, but also considered that this approach might affect the programme's ability to meet the SETs in the future. Therefore, visitors should consider how the education provider ensures that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics in any future assessment.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	St George's, University of London
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (In Service), Full time
Date submission received	03 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13993-F7M5J3

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:

David Comber	Paramedic
Julie Leaper	Dietitian
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07877

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (In Service)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic

First intake	01 January 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 70
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07879

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 04 July 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)	MMED Sci Clinical Communication Studies, Full time
Date submission received	03 May 2019
Case reference	CAS-13910-V3G9V8

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:

Caroline Sykes	Speech and language therapist
Mark Widdowfield	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MMED Sci Clinical Communication Studies
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 23
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07882

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: The visitors noted that a new two year pre-registration MMedSci Speech and Language Therapy programme commenced in September 2018, whilst the two year MMedSci (Clinical Communication Sciences) programme is currently being phased out with no further intakes and will end in February 2020. From reviewing the evidence, the visitors noted the process in place ensuring availability for learners on the MMED Sci Clinical Communication Studies . However, the visitors could not find information regarding how capacity is determined especially considering the overlap of learners on both the programmes. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate how is capacity determined keeping in mind the combined learner numbers of the three and four year programmes.

Suggested evidence: Process in place to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning for learners on all programmes.

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: From reviewing the evidence provided for this standard, the visitors noted information and processes regarding various aspects of the practice-based learning. As per the requirement for this revised standard, the visitors could not find information about the process in place for learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors noted there is mention of safeguarding, but not regarding the wider implications of safeguarding and how learners will be enabled to deal with situations such as staff shortages or bullying by staff members. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine if this standard has been met,

Suggested evidence: Information or relevant document regarding what process is in place for learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. Additionally, how learners are enabled about this process. Information regarding any whistleblowing policies in place.

4.11 The education provider must identify and communicate to learners the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, and must have associated monitoring processes in place.

Reason: From reviewing the appendix 16 staff-student liaison meeting minutes (point 24), the visitors noted disparity in the information regarding attendance for learners. It was mentioned that attendance was compulsory, but was monitored randomly. Due to this statement, the visitors were not clear if attendance monitoring processes are in place and how can action for poor attendance be taken if it is monitored randomly. Therefore, the education provide must provide more information regarding their attendance policy and clarity around monitoring procedures

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating what is the attendance policy, how is it monitored and how is it communicated to learners

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 04 July 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)	B.Med Sci (Hons) Speech, Full time
Date submission received	30 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13995-F6H2S9

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:

Caroline Sykes	Speech and language therapist
Mark Widdowfield	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	B.Med Sci (Hons) Speech
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Speech and language therapist
First intake	01 September 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 28
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07883

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: The visitors noted that the three-year B.Med Sci (Hons) Speech started in September 2018, whilst the four year programme is currently being phased out with no further recruitments and will end in August 2021. From reviewing the evidence, the visitors are satisfied with regards to the process in place ensuring availability for learners on the three year programme. However, the visitors could not find information regarding how capacity is determined with overlap of continuing learners on the four year programme along with the ones on the three year programme. Therefore, the

education provider must demonstrate how is capacity determined keeping in mind the combined learner numbers of the three and four year programmes.

Suggested evidence: Process in place to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning for learners on all programmes. What contingency plans will the education provider have, should there be more learners and less placements, considering the combined learner numbers of the three and four year programmes.

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: From reviewing the evidence provided for this standard, the visitors noted information and processes regarding various aspects of the practice-based learning. They also noted the education provider stating there is no changes in this standard, as per the standards mapping document. As per the requirement for this revised standard, the visitors could not find information regarding how learners are enabled and what process is in place to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. For example: The visitors noted there is mention about safeguarding, but not regarding the wider implications of safeguarding and how learners will be enabled to deal with situations such as staff shortages or bullying by staff members. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine if this standard has been met.

Suggested evidence: Information or relevant document regarding what process is in place for learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. Additionally, how learners are enabled about this process. Information regarding any whistleblowing policies in place.

4.11 The education provider must identify and communicate to learners the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, and must have associated monitoring processes in place.

Reason: From reviewing the appendix 16 staff-student liaison meeting minutes (point 24), the visitors noted disparity in the information regarding attendance for learners. It was mentioned that attendance was compulsory, but was monitored randomly. Due to this statement, the visitors were not clear if clear attendance monitoring processes are in place and how action for poor attendance will be taken if it is monitored randomly. Therefore, the education provide must provide more information regarding their attendance policy and clarity around monitoring procedures

Suggested evidence: Information demonstrating what is the attendance policy, how is it monitored and how is it communicated to learners

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 04 July 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)	Practitioner Doctorate in Psychotherapeutic and Counselling Psychology (PsychD), Full time
Date submission received	03 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13922-W0W9H8

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:

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

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Practitioner Doctorate in Psychotherapeutic and Counselling Psychology (PsychD)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 January 1994
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07919

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

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

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider informed the visitors about a recent change to the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme. 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.

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 provided Internal quality documents (APR). These documents review Clinical Supervision at Clinical Placements and Collaboration with Clinical Placements'. Each of these areas reflect on how the programme has performed over the last year. However, from this documentation, the visitors were unable to identify how the education provider ensured the availability and capacity for all learners. For this standard, we require the education provider to have a process in place to make sure that all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning. From the information provided, the visitors were not clear what this process was, or how it is effective. The visitors require further evidence about the process the education provider has in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which demonstrates the effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

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

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider stated that learners are taught to recognise situations of risks to service users' wellbeing through lecturers dedicated to assessment, risk assessment and ethical decision making. The education provider also stated that their placement contract and approval process ensures that trainees are aware of the placement policy and supported with raising concerns and taking action. The visitors received no further evidence to support these statements. This standard requires the education provider to ensure that learners are able to recognise situations where service users may be at risk, support them in raising any concerns and ensure action is taken in response to those concerns. From the statements provided the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures this. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to determine how this standard is met.

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

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 stated the range of professions which input into the programme (such as nurses and health psychologists)

and how guest speakers deliver content throughout the programme. In addition, the education provider stated this input was mainly delivered through the Counselling Psychology Issues and Competencies unit. The visitors did not receive any further evidence to demonstrate this standard how was met. This standard requires that learners are able to work with, and from, professionals and learning in other relevant professions for the benefit of service users and carers. From the statements provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures this. The visitors therefore require further evidence which demonstrates how learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which demonstrates how the education provider ensures 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: To evidence this standard, the education provider stated how learners are reminded that they are expected to abide by the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. This is in relation to their work in placement as well as in relation to their colleagues and university staff. The education provider also stated this was demonstrated through summative and formative assessments in practice-based learning. The visitors did not receive any further evidence to demonstrate this standard how was met. This standard requires learners to be able to demonstrate they understand the expectations associated with being a regulated professional by the time they complete the programme. From the statements provided the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures this. The visitors therefore require further evidence which demonstrates how learning are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 04 July 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)	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology), Full time
Date submission received	01 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13925-N1C5W9

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:

Elizabeth Ross	Hearing aid dispenser
Hugh Crawford	Hearing aid dispenser
Shaista Ahmad	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 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 8
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07926

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 education provider states that “Programme directors for regulated professional programmes will be registered health care professionals”. The visitors were directed to a programme director role descriptor which outlined the responsibilities of a programme leader. However, from reviewing this document the visitors were unable to determine what arrangements are in place to ensure that the person appointed to the role would be 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 arrangements in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the

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

Suggested evidence: 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.

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

Reason: As part of the submission, the visitors were provided with an example of a contract which is used between the education provider and the practice placement providers. Additionally a sample audit document was provided which detailed the audit process used on the programme. The visitors noted that from this information there was a process in place with the aim to ensure the availability and capacity of practice based learning. However, from reviewing the annual programme review document the visitors noted that there had been some challenges in accommodating increased learner numbers in securing sufficient clinical practice-based learning opportunities for some programmes. From this information the visitors were not able to establish whether this was applicable to the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology) programme. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider would continue to provide practice-based learning opportunities for all learners on the programme. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that all learners on the programme would have access to practice-based learning opportunities.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence demonstrating that all learners on the programme will have access to practice-based learning which meets their learning needs.

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

Reason: As part of the submission, the education provider informed the visitors that there had been some changes to the staff delivering the programme. The visitors were provided with curriculum vitae's of two new staff members on the programme. However, from this information the visitors were not able to determine whether there was an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme as no information had been provided about the other teaching staff on the programme. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 04 July 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)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	30 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13934-M9X9Y7

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

David Comber	Paramedic
Paul Bates	Paramedic
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 32
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07930

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 programme was approved to have their first intake in September 2018. Therefore there is no internal quality report for 2016 – 2017. The education provider has provided the internal quality report for 2017 – 2018.
External examiner reports from the last two years	No	The programme was approved to have their first intake in September 2018. The programme has not yet run, therefore the education provider does not have an external examiner report for the last two years.
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	The programme has not had external examiner reports, therefore there are no responses.
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	The programme was approved to have their first intake in September 2018. The programme has not yet run. Therefore, the education provider does not have evidence of monitoring of practice-based learning for the two years.
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	As above, the education provider does not have evidence of monitoring of service user and carer involvement in the last two years.

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 04 July 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) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	01 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-14013-N8L6S1

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.....	7

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 prescriber
Matthew Catterall	Paramedic
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 April 2015
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07936

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	No	The external examiner report for 2017 - 18 was provided, no report for 2016-17 was provided.
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	Visitors noted external examiner comments present in the external examiner report for 2017-18, but there was no report provided for 2016-17. Additionally, there were two email conversation documents sent labelled as 'appendix 2 EE comments', but the visitors could not determine if these are actually external examiner responses and to which report does it correspond to.
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 evidence provided for this standard, the visitors noted the documents are generic university documents regarding practice-based learning; highlighting guidance, selection and approval criteria of new practice-based learning settings. As per the 'Work Based Learning and Placement Learning Framework' document, the visitors noted the placement coordinator is responsible for confirming any new practice-based learning settings. However, there was no information provided regarding the process in place to ensure availability and capacity for all learners on the programme. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence demonstrating the process in place to make sure that all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning.

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

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

Reason: For this annual monitoring audit, we require the education provider to submit evidence of their monitoring of service user and carer involvement in the programme for the last two years. From reviewing the evidence provided, the visitors noted that service users and carers are involved during the admissions process. From the information provided, the visitors could not see how service users and carers were involved through other areas of the programme, or how this has been monitored. . As per the requirement for this audit, the education provider must demonstrate how they have monitored service user and carer involvement in the last two years. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence of how service users and carers contribute to the overall effectiveness of the programme, and how this has been monitored for the last two years.

Suggested evidence: Information regarding who the service users and carers are, how are they involved in the programme and how is their contribution monitored and evaluated.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider provided a role descriptor for learners' representation at course committee meetings. From the information provided, the visitors were not clear of learners involvement at these meetings and how this would ensure that involving learners has contributed to the quality, effectiveness and continuous improvement of the programme. The visitors were also not clear on the process in place to ask for, allow and encourage learners to be involved in the programme. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence demonstrating how learner involvement takes place and how is it used for the overall effectiveness of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Information regarding process of in place to ask for, allow and encourage learners to be involved. Evidence must demonstrate how involving learners has contributed to the quality, effectiveness and continuous improvement of the programme.

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

Reason: From the evidence provided for this standard, the visitors were directed to a flow chart demonstrating the steps to be followed to raise concerns, and the various stages post raising concerns regarding practice-based learning and learners. However, as per the requirement for this standard, the visitors could not see information about how learners are enabled to recognise situations where service users may be at risk. Additionally, the course handbook was referred to as evidence for this standard; however, this was not included in the submission. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns regarding the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Suggested evidence: Course handbook document and information regarding the process about how learners are supported and made to recognise situations, where service users may be at risk.

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider referred to the course handbook as evidence. However, this document was not included in the submission. The visitors therefore were unable to determine how the learning outcomes will ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). Therefore, the visitors require further information, which demonstrates the learning outcomes ensure learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs. 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.

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 referred to the course handbook for this standard, which was not included in the submission. The education provider also referred to appendix 7, which referred to an annual inter professional learning conference. However, the visitors could not see any information regarding how learners are able to learn with and from other relevant professions. The appendix 7 document mentioned interprofessional learning opportunities embedded in all the programmes. However, as the course handbook was not available for viewing, the visitors were unable to make a judgement if this standard has been met. The education provider must provide evidence

demonstrating how the programme ensures that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Suggested evidence: Information about how interprofessional learning is structured in the programme, which ensures that all learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

5.2 The structure, duration and range of practice-based learning must support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency.

Reason: The visitors could not find information regarding the process in place to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning, as mentioned under standard 3.6 above. For this standard the visitors read the 'review of placement EPF17Moo2' document and noted there was mention of the allocations and movement of specialist placements, which were yet to be confirmed and/or finalised for all learners on this programme. Due to this, the visitors were not clear how learners will have access to an appropriate range of practice-based learning experiences and settings for their profession. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate how they ensure all learners have access to an appropriate range of practice-based learning which will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency (SOPs).

Suggested evidence: Information about how the education provider ensures learners have access to an appropriate range of practice-based learning experiences, which support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the SOPs.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Reason: From reviewing the monitoring practice minutes document, the visitors noted issues have been raised in relation to mentor training at the practice-based learning settings. The visitors read reassurance from the chair of the meeting that communication would continue to keep on top of any issues. There was no further information in any of the other documents to demonstrate whether this issue has not been resolved, or what the process has been to continue to resolve the issue. The requirement for this standard is to ensure education providers have processes in place to respond when any concerns arise, to ensure learners' progress is not prevented. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate if there continues to be an effective system in place to ensure quality of practice-based learning is maintained at all times

Suggested evidence: Information about how the issues raised regarding mentor training have been dealt with by the education provider, to ensure quality of practice-based learning is maintained.

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

Reason: From reviewing the monitoring practice minutes document, the visitors noted there were issues regarding mentor training at the practice-based learning settings. Additionally, there were four more learners recruited, above the education provider's proposed target. The visitors did not see information about whether a strategy was in place to accommodate the four additional learners. Therefore, the education provider

must demonstrate how they ensure there are adequate staff in the practice-based learning environment.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how they continue to ensure there are adequate numbers of practice educators in the practice-based learning setting, given the additional four learners.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted issues were raised in the monitoring practice minutes document regarding mentor training at the practice-based learning settings, as mentioned under standard 5.3 above. As it was not clear if and how this has been resolved, the visitors were not clear if practice educators' training is regular and up to date. As per the requirement for this standard, practice educators must be appropriately prepared, so they can support learning and assess learners effectively. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate if practice educators undergo training appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme

Suggested evidence: Information regarding how issue related to mentor training got resolved. How regular practice educators undergo training at the practice-based learning settings which is appropriate to their role learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider referred to the course handbook as evidence. However, this document was not included in the submission. The visitors therefore were unable to determine how 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 (SCPEs). Therefore, the visitors require further information, which demonstrates assessment throughout the programme ensures and allows learners to demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs. In this way, the visitors will be able to make a judgement about whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating how assessment throughout the programme address learners being able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the 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 04 July 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)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	30 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-14024-W6X3V2

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:

David Comber	Paramedic
Julie Leaper	Dietitian
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07943

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 04 July 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of East London
Name of programme(s)	Professional Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology (D.Ed.Ch.Psych), Full time
Date submission received	01 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13953-Z7C0P9

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 Richards	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
Ruth Baker	Practitioner psychologist - Clinical psychologist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology (D.Ed.Ch.Psych)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Educational psychologist
First intake	01 January 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 14
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07952

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	The visitors could not find evidence of this in the submission.
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: For this standard, the education provider said fieldwork tutors are seconded from services. Learners in year one of the programme are placed in groups with those

services. The education provider said that as part of the SEEL consortium there is regular engagement with practice education providers, who provide practice-based learning for year two and year three learners. The principal education psychologists within SEEL areas allocate practice-based learning on a geographically suitability basis. As evidence, the education provider submitted SEEL consortium terms of reference.

For this standard, we require the education provider to have a process in place to make sure that all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning. From the information provided, the visitors were not clear what this process was, or how it is effective. The visitors understood that meetings take place, however they have not seen evidence of how this has ensured that all learners on the programme have access to practice-based learning. The visitors require further evidence about the process the education provider has to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence about the process in place which ensures the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

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

Reason: For this standard, the education provider said that learners will have a session on the HCPC and BPS codes and responsibilities, and mentioned a module which has input on safeguarding, both from the perspective of listening to service users and reporting concerns. The education provider also said that on practice-based learning, the practice education provider is required to inform learners of local safeguarding policies, and in years two and three the practice education provider is encouraged to offer training in this area.

The visitors note that the practice education providers have local policies. However, the visitors were not clear how the education provider has oversight of this, or how they ensure learners have access to this information. Learners may encounter situations which cause concern during practice-based learning or the remainder of the programme. This standard requires there to be a process or processes which cover all parts of the programme. This standard also requires the education provider to ensure that learners are able to recognise situations where service users may be at risk, and supporting them in raising any concerns and making sure action is taken in response to those concerns. From the information provided, the visitors could not see how the education provider ensures this. Therefore, the visitors require further information to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence about the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users to determine whether this standard is met.

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

Reason: In the SETs mapping document, the education provider said that practice-based learning activities include multi-agency work in years two and three. The education provider also said that there are external speakers and postgraduate seminar

programmes, and that there are plans to arrange joint sessions across Doctorate programmes in clinical and counselling psychology.

From the information provided, the visitors could not see evidence about how interprofessional learning is structured into the programme, which would ensure all learners on the programme are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in the other relevant professions. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how interprofessional learning is structured in the programme, which will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

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

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Reason: For this annual monitoring audit, we now require the education provider to submit evidence of their monitoring of practice-based learning for the last two academic years. In the submission for this programme, the visitors could not see any clear evidence of monitoring of practice-based learning for the last two years. Evidence of monitoring should include information about on-going practice-based learning capacity, outcomes of practice-based learning quality monitoring activity, and feedback from stakeholders. We expect the education provider to be able to demonstrate areas identified for development and any information regarding action plans, to demonstrate monitoring.

From the information provided, the visitors could not see evidence which demonstrates monitoring of practice-based learning over the last two years. Therefore, the visitors could not determine that the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for ensuring the quality of practice-based learning. The visitors require evidence of monitoring of practice-based learning for the last two years to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of monitoring of practice-based learning for the last two academic years.

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 04 July 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Name of programme(s)	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology, Full time Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology, Part time
Date submission received	01 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-13965-M5Z9S5

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	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 January 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 14
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07976

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)

Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 January 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 14
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07975

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 referred the visitors to a Programme Leader Role description. The role description discusses the duties the programme leader would complete within the role but not how the education provider goes about ensuring this person is appropriately qualified and experienced. 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.

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 provided a Programme specification, a Placement handbook, a Placement Agreement Form and a commentary within the Standards of education and training mapping document. These documents outlined that it is compulsory that learners are in suitable clinical placements and that a learner is responsible for seeking and arranging their own practice based learning. If the learner is unable to source their own learning experience, the education provider assists through the placement coordinator / placement team (who hold a register of approved providers), internal advertisements and an annual placement fair. However, from the information provided, the visitors were not clear of the process in case a learner is unable to secure a placement within sufficient time. In order to ensure the availability of practice-based learning for all learners, the visitors require further information which demonstrates what happens should a learner fail to secure a placement.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process in place to ensure the availability of practice-based learning for learners who are unable to source practice-based learning within sufficient time.

Section 5: 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 04 July 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 West London
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, FT (Full time)
Date submission received	01 April 2019
Case reference	CAS-14045-Z1X8N8

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner
Rebecca Helen Lowes	Operating department practitioner
Temilolu Odunaike	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 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07980

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 04 July 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](#).