

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Aston University
<b>Programme title</b>	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Biomedical Scientist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitor(s)</b>	Robert Keeble (Biomedical scientist) David Houliston (Biomedical scientist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Abdur Razzaq
<b>Date of postal review</b>	18 September 2014

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
  - Entry information
  - University fitness to practise policy
  - University 2020 strategy
  - The draft life and health sciences school strategy 2020
  - Biology/BMS programme strategy 2012 – 2016
  - University annual monitoring policy
  - University personal tutoring policy

- Schedule of workshops for applied placement students, 2012/13
- Current set of workshops for applied placement students, 2014/2015
- Past training the trainers sessions

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Scottish Ambulance Academy and Glasgow Caledonian University
<b>Name of awarding / validating body</b>	Glasgow Caledonian University
<b>Programme title</b>	DipHE Paramedic Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Gordon Pollard (Paramedic)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of postal review</b>	18 August 2014

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report for one year ago
- External examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- There is no internal quality report for 2012–13 as the programme has only run for one year.

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	The Tavistock & Portman NHS Foundation Trust
<b>Name of validating body</b>	University of Essex
<b>Programme title</b>	Doctorate in Child, Community and Educational Psychology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Educational psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Andrew Richards (Educational psychologist) Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of postal review</b>	31 July 2014

### Section two: Submission details

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

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

No response was provided for the external examiner report for 2011–12. There was an email response provided to explain why no response had been provided.

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

#### **6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.**

**Reason:** The visitors noted that there had not been a response to the external examiner report for 2011–12. Also it was noted in both external examiner reports provided that the external examiners do not have oversight on the theses from students on the programme. The external examiners considered that they therefore could not judge student performance throughout the programme. The visitors were concerned that if the external examiners were not involved in the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms across the whole programme then appropriate standards of assessment could be impacted for the programme.

**Suggested documentation:** Documentation evidencing the processes by which the programme ensures its overall standards are appropriately monitored and evaluated, and any contingency process to ensure that external examiner reports are responded to if there should be an issue in responding to external examiners in the future.

#### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

## Annual monitoring visitors' report

### Contents

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

### Section one: Programme details

<b>Name of education provider</b>	The Royal Central School of Speech & Drama
<b>Name validating body</b>	University of London
<b>Programme title</b>	MA Drama and Movement Therapy (Sesame)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Arts therapist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Dramatherapist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	Dianne Gammage (Dramatherapist) Donald Wetherick (Music therapist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of postal review</b>	30 July 2014

### Section two: Submission details

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

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



- Handbook of Academic Regulations
- Quality Assurance Handbook
- Placements Handbook

### Section three: Additional documentation

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

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

**Reason:** The Annual Course Monitoring Report for 2011-12 indicates that the length of the course was extended by 6 weeks in agreement with the Academic Board (Section 4). It is not clear how this change has been communicated to prospective students or how it may affect the date of completion of the programme and eligibility to apply for registration with HCPC.

**Suggested Documentation:** Course information that includes dates and time commitment expected from students, expected date of completion and how this could impact on students' eligibility to apply to the HCPC for registration.

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

**Reason:** The Annual Course Monitoring Report 2011-12 indicated that PhD students were involved in teaching on the programme. It was not clear what level of involvement they had, or how the programme team ensured that the PhD students had the relevant expertise and knowledge to teach on the programme. The visitors would like to receive evidence that demonstrates that the subject areas for the programme are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and experience.

**Suggested Documentation:** CVs or similar documentation for the PhD students delivering teaching on the programme and details of the subject areas and modules they are involved in teaching.

#### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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

#### **Section five: Visitors' comments**

The visitors noted that the current course specification published on the institute's website does not indicate the duration of Term 4. Other term lengths are indicated. While the visitors are satisfied that enough information is available to prospective students to enable them to make a choice about the programme, we would recommend that the document is amended to include this information.

The visitors noted that the QA Handbook (14.5.2) states that "The external examiner for the course must be approved by the HCPC." The visitors would like to remind the education provider that it is the process of appointment via their assessment regulations that is approved by HCPC. It is the appointment of the external examiner is then the responsibility of the education provider, subject to that process.

The visitors also noticed that the HCPC is occasionally still referred to by its old name (HPC) in the different course documents (Course Specification, Placement Handbook etc). The documents should be proofread to ensure that the documentation reflects the correct terminology to ensure students receive the correct information.

## 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

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Plymouth
<b>Programme title</b>	Professional Doctorate in Clinical Psychology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Name and profession of HCPC visitors</b>	George Delafield (Practitioner psychologist) Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist)
<b>HCPC executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of postal review</b>	28 August 2014

### Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
  - Internal quality report for one year ago
  - Internal quality report for two years ago
  - External examiner's report for one year ago
  - External examiner's report for two years ago
  - Response to External examiner's report one year ago
  - Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Details of the self- funding
  - Curriculum vitae for the programme director
  - Revised staffing data to update changes since the visit in 2010

- Programme planning review documents that include details on community based inter-professional learning and processes for raising the issue of whistle-blowing and obtaining service user and carer feedback.

### **Section three: Additional documentation**

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

### **Section four: Recommendation of the visitors**

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

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

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