

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Awarding institution (if different from education provider)	N/A
Programme name	MA Music Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Jennifer French (Arts Therapist) Dianne Gammage (Arts Therapist)
Education executive	Benjamin Potter
Date of assessment day / postal review	20 September 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

Section Three: Additional Documentation

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

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmt	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-20	a	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Anglia Ruskin - MA Music Therapy - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors	3

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Colchester Institute
Awarding institution	University of Essex
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time accelerated Part time
HPC visitors	Susan Lloyd (Occupational Therapist) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	15 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
 - Internal quality report for one year ago
 - Internal quality report for two years ago
 - External Examiner's for one year ago
 - External Examiner's Report for two years ago
 - Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
 - Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- No internal quality report for one year ago because the programme has moved to the University of Essex.

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Reason: From their review of documentation, the visitors noted concerns raised by the external examiner (reports dated 16 July 2008 and 14 July 2009) surrounding the resources available to students and low staffing levels on the programmes. The visitors were concerned that comments had been made in two consecutive years as this raised questions about how the external examiners reports were being used by the education provider and therefore whether the programmes continue to be managed effectively.

The visitors also discussed that, on 1 September 2009, the programmes moved to the University of Essex and they were no longer open to new intakes. Once students currently undertaking the programmes have completed them, the programmes will be closed.

The 14 July 2009 report mentions an action plan to resolve the external examiners concerns urgently upon the move to the University of Essex. The visitors did not receive any further information about the action plan or how the move to the University of Essex addressed the external examiner concerns. To ensure that the programmes continue to be managed effectively, the visitors would like to receive information about how the external examiners concerns have been addressed.

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

Reason: From their review of documentation, the visitors noted concerns raised by the external examiner (reports dated 16 July 2008 and 14 July 2009) surrounding the resources available to students and staffing levels on the programmes.

The visitors also noted that, on 1 September 2009, the programmes transferred to the University of Essex and the programmes were no longer open to new intakes. Once students currently undertaking the programmes have finished, the programmes will be closed.

The visitors were concerned that the external examiner comments had appeared in two consecutive academic years. However, they did recognise that in the 14 July 2009 report, the education provider had an action plan in place to resolve these issues urgently upon the move to the University of Essex.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-09	c	EDU	PPR	AM Report Colchester - BSc (Hons) OT - FT acc & PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

The visitors did not receive information relating to the action plan or how the move to the University of Essex addressed the external examiner concerns relating to low staffing numbers. The visitors would therefore like to receive further information about the low staffing levels available to the programmes to ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver effective programmes.

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: From their review of documentation, the visitors noted concerns raised by the external examiner (reports dated 16 July 2008 and 14 July 2009) surrounding the resources available to students and low staffing levels on the programmes.

The visitors also noted that, on 1 September 2009, the programmes transferred to the University of Essex and the programmes were no longer open to new intakes. Once students currently undertaking the programmes have finished, the programmes will be closed.

The visitors were concerned that the external examiner comments had appeared in two consecutive academic years but did recognise that in the 14 July 2009 report, the education provider had an action plan in place to resolve these issues urgently upon the move to the University of Essex.

The visitors did not receive information relating to the action plan or how the move to the University of Essex addressed the external examiner concerns relating to the resources available to students. The visitors would therefore like to receive further information about the resources to ensure that they adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programmes.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-09	c	EDU	PPR	AM Report Colchester - BSc (Hons) OT - FT acc & PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Colchester Institute
Awarding institution	University of Essex
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitors	Susan Lloyd (Occupational Therapist) Karen Harrison (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day	15 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
 - Internal quality report for one year ago
 - Internal quality report for two years ago
 - External Examiner's for one year ago
 - External Examiner's Report for two years ago
 - Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
 - Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- No internal quality report for one year ago because the programme has moved to the University of Essex.

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Reason: From their review of documentation, the visitors noted concerns raised by the external examiner (reports dated 16 July 2008 and 14 July 2009) surrounding resources available to students and staffing levels on the programmes. The visitors were concerned that similar comments had been made in consecutive years as this raised questions about how the external examiners reports were being used by the education provider and therefore whether the programmes continue to be managed effectively.

The visitors also discussed that, on 1 September 2009, the programmes moved to the University of Essex and they were no longer open to new intakes. Once students currently undertaking the programmes have completed them, the programmes will be closed.

The 14 July 2009 report mentions an action plan to resolve the external examiners concerns urgently upon the move to the University of Essex. The visitors did not receive any further information about the action plan or how the move to the University of Essex addressed the external examiner concerns. To ensure that the programmes continue to be managed effectively, the visitors would like to receive information about how the external examiners concerns have been addressed.

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

Reason: From their review of documentation, the visitors noted concerns raised by the external examiner (reports dated 16 July 2008 and 14 July 2009) surrounding the resources available to students and staffing levels on the programmes.

The visitors also noted that, on 1 September 2009, the programmes transferred to the University of Essex and the programmes were no longer open to new intakes. Once students currently undertaking the programmes have finished, the programmes will be closed.

The visitors were concerned that similar external examiner comments had appeared in consecutive academic years. However, they did recognise that in the 14 July 2009 report, the education provider had an action plan in place to resolve these issues urgently upon the move to the University of Essex.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-09	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report Colchester - BSc (Hons) PH - PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

The visitors did not receive information relating to the action plan or how the move to the University of Essex addressed the external examiner concerns relating to staffing. The visitors would therefore like to receive further information about the staffing levels available to the programmes to ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver effective programmes.

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: From their review of documentation, the visitors noted concerns raised by the external examiner (reports dated 16 July 2008 and 14 July 2009) surrounding the resources available to students and staffing levels on the programmes.

The visitors also noted that, on 1 September 2009, the programmes transferred to the University of Essex and the programmes were no longer open to new intakes. Once students currently undertaking the programmes have finished, the programmes will be closed.

The visitors were concerned that similar external examiner comments had appeared in consecutive academic years but did recognise that in the 14 July 2009 report, the education provider had an action plan in place to resolve these issues urgently upon the move to the University of Essex.

The visitors did not receive information relating to the action plan or how the move to the University of Essex addressed the external examiner concerns relating to the resources available to students. The visitors would therefore like to receive further information about the resources to ensure that they adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programmes.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-09	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report Colchester - BSc (Hons) PH - PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	3

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	Local Analgesia with Nail Surgery for Podiatrists
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Paul Blakeman (Podiatrist) Phil Mandy (Podiatrist)
Education executive	Mandy Hargood
Postal review	17 August 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

- Email exchange between programme leader Christine Skinner and HPC centring largely around the extent of external examiner involvement and internal monitoring.
- Protocol for practical skills and consent documents
- LA assessment documents
- Nail surgery documents
- Programme timetable
- Reflective log

- Last student cohort comments

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Reason: The only documentation received by the visitors was the HPC audit document. The visitors did not receive any documentation relating to the quality monitoring of the programme such as a programme annual monitoring reports or any external examiners reports or comments. In relation to this there was correspondence between the education provider and HPC where the education provider indicated that external examiner comments would be provided and that no other quality assurance material for the programme was available. The visitors have yet to receive any further documentation. Although the visitors recognise that the education provider has indicated that this programme is run as a CPD programme with no credits, as a HPC approved programme the visitors require the stated documentation, or equivalent, in order to determine if the programme continues to meet our standards.

Suggested documentation: Any analysis of the quality of the programme such as external examiners reports and internal quality reports.

6.5 There must be effective mechanisms in place to assure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Reason: The only documentation received by the visitors was the HPC audit document. The visitors did not receive any documentation relating to the quality monitoring of the programme such as a programme annual monitoring reports or any external examiners reports or comments. In relation to this there was correspondence between the education provider and HPC where the education provider indicated that external examiner comments would be provided and that no other quality assurance material for the programme was available. The visitors have yet to receive any further documentation. Although the visitors recognise that the education provider has indicated that this programme is run as a CPD programme with no credits, as a HPC approved programme the visitors require the stated documentation, or equivalent, in order to determine if the programme continues to meet our standards.

Suggested documentation: Any analysis of the external quality of the programme such as external examiners reports.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-17	d	EDU	PPR	AM Report GCU LA PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Visitors' Comments

In future there must be evidence that an appropriate internal monitoring and evaluation system is in place and reports submitted as evidence of appropriate standards.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmt	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-17	d	EDU	PPR	AM Report GCU LA PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Annual Monitoring Requirements	2
Section Four: Additional Documentation	2
Section Five: Recommendation of the visitors	4

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Scottish Ambulance College
Programme name	IHCD Paramedic Award
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitors	Andrew Newton (Paramedic) Graham Harris (Paramedic)
Education executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	3 August 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's Report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Additional documentation for Ambulance Trust AM requirements

The education provider explained via email that there is no extant external examiners report for two years ago. This was a subject which was covered in the approval visit to the programme which occurred in September 2008.

- Monthly Reports on Student Progress
- Individual Evaluation Forms used on programmes

- Matrix of Net Provider Evaluation Scores for historic Courses
- Minutes from Paramedic Foundation and Practice Team meetings
- Minutes from Practice Placement Education Team meetings
- Change Process for developing new programme ideas

Section Three: Additional Annual Monitoring Requirements

The following documentation was submitted in response to the additional annual monitoring requirements for the programme:

1. An update on the progress of implementing and embedding professional skills into the delivery of their programme.

- Paramedic Programme Handbook
- Practice Programme Frequently Asked Questions Sheets
- Practice Placement Portfolio Year 1
- Practice Placement Portfolio Year 2
- Queries about this – include in SETs

2. An update on the progress of implementing the range of appropriate placements.

- Practice Placement Approval Process
- Example completed placement documents
- Matrix of progress against current and planned placement areas

3. An update on the availability resources and confirmation of the ongoing provisions.

- Paramedic Programme Team Structure
- PPEd/Mentorship Qualification Outline
- Professional Practice Degree Information for current Paramedic Education Specialists Development
- Working Together for Better Patient Care – Service Strategic Framework
- Realising Our Potential – Learning Strategy

Section Four: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Five.

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation on how the programme has addressed the Education & Training Committee's requirements for updates on: progress of implementing and embedding professional skills into the delivery of the programme; progress of

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-14	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - SAC - IHCD PA - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

implementing the range of appropriate placements; availability of resources and confirmation of the ongoing provisions.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Reason: The visitors noted in the education provider's response to the external examiner's report, the production of a new marking guide for the Paediatric/Obstetric practical assessments and amendments to the paramedic foundation student folder. However, these documents were not included as part of the submission. To support the education provider's response to the external examiner's report and to ensure that the programme continues to be managed effectively, the visitors would like to receive copies of these documents.

3.3 There must be a named programme leader who has overall responsibility for the programme and who should be either on the relevant part of the HPC Register or otherwise appropriately qualified and experienced.

Reason: From reading the documentation, it appeared to the visitors that the programme leader had changed since the visit in September 2008. The visitors were unsure when or if this had occurred. In order to ensure that this SET continues to be met, they would like to receive confirmation as to whom the programme leader is and if this has changed, receive the appropriate documentation.

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.

Reason: In the external examiner's report, the visitors noted the comment 'It is also not clear how many times the assessment must be undertake to be successful on the course, or at which stage on the course the assessment must have been passed'. To ensure that a student can demonstrate fitness to practise, the visitors would like to receive confirmation of the education provider's assessment design and procedures.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-14	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - SAC - IHCD PA - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section Five: Recommendation of the visitors

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

There is also sufficient evidence the programme has addressed the Education & Training Committee's requirements for updates on: progress of implementing and embedding professional skills into the delivery of the programme; progress of implementing the range of appropriate placements; availability of resources and confirmation of the ongoing provisions. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Visitor comments

The visitors wished to point out that the comprehensive nature of the submission was not entirely conducive to reviewing the submission. While HPC's Education and Training Committee asked for some additional information and while it is recognised that this required additional documentation; the visitors articulated that the education provider should consider the relevance of submitted documentation as the documentation necessary for an audit submission such as this is usually far less than provided for this audit. The annual monitoring process is a retrospective one focusing on programmes with ongoing approval and as such a submission usually only consists of the required documentation as highlighted in Section Two. Any additional information is only needed when the programme has undergone changes which affect how the standards of education and training (SETs) continue to be met. The visitors would therefore like to highlight to the education provider that the volume of documentation, and subsequently work, is not necessary for any future HPC annual monitoring audit.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-14	b	EDU	RPT	AM report - SAC - IHCD PA - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details.....	1
Section Two: Submission Details.....	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation.....	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors.....	3

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	University of Strathclyde
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Prosthetics and Orthotics
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitors	Jo Jackson (Physiotherapist) Stephen Osborne (Prosthetist and Orthotist)
Education executive	Mandy Hargood
Postal review	26 July 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

The External Examiner's reports for two years ago, as well as the response to those reports, were part of the requested additional documentation.

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: On reading the documentation provided the visitors noticed that there was no response to the concerns raised by the external examiner about the financial constraints and reduced practical experience within the education provider based portion of the course. The education provider appears to have answered the concern by explaining that the reduction in practical teaching could be supplemented by an extra 5 weeks for weak students. However, the external examiner was commenting on a reduction in academic teaching time and he did not feel the placement prosthetists were equipped to provide this training on placement so this did not appear to be a solution. The visitors would like to receive documentation that clearly explains how the education provider is ensuring that any financial impact on the programme is not detrimental to the student learning experience on practice placement.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Reason: On their reading of the documentation provided, the visitors found that the external examiner report for 2007/08 and the response were missing. The visitors had received the report for 2009/10 which is not covered by this audit period. The internal review reports submitted relate to 2007/08 and 2008/09 so the external examiner forms should match these periods. Therefore the visitors would like to receive the external examiner report and response for 2007/2008.

5.5.1 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: On reading the documentation provided the visitors noticed that there was no response to the concerns raised by the external examiner about the financial constraints and reduced practical experience within the education provider based portion of the course. The education provider appears to have answered the concern by explaining that the reduction in practical teaching could be supplemented by an extra 5 weeks for weak students. However, the external examiner was commenting on a reduction in academic teaching time and he did not feel the placement prosthetists were equipped to provide this training on placement so this did not appear to be a solution. This suggests that the placement experiences available may result in students not achieving all the required placement outcomes.

The visitors would like to receive documentation that clearly explains how the education provider is ensuring that any financial impact on the programme is not detrimental to the student learning.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-13	c	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Strathclyde - BSc (Hons) P&O - FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

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

Reason: On reading the documentation the visitors noted that the home institution of the current external examiner appears to be one of the programmes placement locations. In order to ensure that the programme has the appropriate externality of review they would like to receive documentation that explains the process for selecting external examiners to the programme.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-13	c	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Strathclyde - BSc (Hons) P&O - FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors	3

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	University of Strathclyde
Programme name	MSci Prosthetics and Orthotics
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitors	Jo Jackson (Physiotherapist) Stephen Osborne (Prosthetist and Orthotist)
Education executive	Mandy Hargood
Postal review	26 July 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

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

The External Examiner's reports for two years ago, as well as the response to those reports, were part of the requested additional documentation.

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: On reading the documentation provided the visitors noticed that there was no response to the concerns raised by the external examiner about the financial constraints and reduced practical experience within the education provider based portion of the course. The education provider appears to have answered the concern by explaining that the reduction in practical teaching could be supplemented by an extra 5 weeks for weak students. However, the external examiner was commenting on a reduction in academic teaching time and he did not feel the placement prosthetists were equipped to provide this training on placement so this did not appear to be a solution. The visitors would like to receive documentation that clearly explains how the education provider is ensuring that any financial impact on the programme is not detrimental to the student learning experience on practice placement.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Reason: On their reading of the documentation provided, the visitors found that the external examiner report for 2007/08 and the response are missing. The visitors received the report for 2009/10 which is not covered by this audit period. The internal review reports submitted relate to 2007/08 and 2008/09 so the external examiner forms should match these periods. Therefore the visitors would like to receive the external examiner report and response for 2007/2008.

5.5 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: On reading the documentation provided the visitors noticed that there was no response to the concerns raised by the external examiner about the financial constraints and reduced practical experience within the education provider based portion of the course. The education provider appears to have answered the concern by explaining that the reduction in practical teaching could be supplemented by an extra 5 weeks for weak students. However, the external examiner was commenting on a reduction in academic teaching time and he did not feel the placement prosthetists were equipped to provide this training on placement so this did not appear to be a solution. This suggests that the placement experiences available may result in students not achieving all the required placement outcomes.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-13	c	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Strathclyde - MSci P&O - FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

The visitors would like to receive documentation that clearly explains how the education provider is ensuring that any financial impact on the programme is not detrimental to the student learning.

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

Reason: On reading the documentation the visitors noted that the home institution of the current external examiner appears to be one of the programmes placement locations. In order to ensure that the programme has the appropriate externality of review they would like to receive documentation that explains the process for selecting external examiners to the programme.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmt	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-13	c	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Strathclyde - MSci P&O - FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None