

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

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

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme title	Pharmacology for Podiatrists
Mode of delivery	Part time
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Alison Wishart (Podiatrist) James Pickard (Podiatrist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	17 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided 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 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 Internal Quality Reports or External Examiners reports were provided for this programme. The course is run upon request as it is a Continuing professional development programme (CPD). It has not been delivered in the last two academic years.

- Glasgow Caledonian University Quality assurance and enhancement handbook – Section 4 programme monitoring

- Glasgow Caledonian University Complaint mediation and resolution procedure
- Glasgow Caledonian University School of Health – Code of professional conduct and fitness to practise: Policy and procedures for staff and student guidance

Section three: Additional documentation

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

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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

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

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

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-05-22	a	EDU	RPT	AM report GCU POM PT	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 five: Visitors' comments	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Roehampton University
Programme title	MA Music Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality	Music therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Jennifer French (Music therapist) Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	28 March 2012

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided 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 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
 - Letter of on-going appointment of external examiner

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.

3.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided for this annual monitoring submission the external examiner report (Sutton 2009-2010) some concerns around the amount of tutor time available for students, “The tutor team is stretched to a point at which any further reduction in resources would result in a significant and potentially dangerous drop in standard for the assessment processes for students.” (p2). The visitors noted the response to the external examiner report appeared to be incomplete in the response to the comments around staffing, “The report also commented upon how staff are stretched within their resources as regard tutor time available but that they provide a very high standard of teaching. The [incomplete].” (response to Sutton 2009-2010). The visitors also noted that the same response document did not have a completed section 3 “Responses to the below will follow in due course after reference to University bodies”. The visitors additionally noted the education provider had not provided a response to the external examiners report 2010-2011 (Loth 2010-2011). The visitors were concerned the monitoring and evaluation processes in place for the programme were not being appropriately concluded and so may not be effective in their use. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: The visitors suggest further information about the incomplete and missing responses or the completed documents could be submitted.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided for this annual monitoring submission the external examiner report (Sutton 2009-2010) some concerns around the amount of tutor time available for students, “The tutor team is stretched to a point at which any further reduction in resources would result in a significant and potentially dangerous drop in standard for the assessment processes for students.” (p2). The visitors noted the response to the external examiner report appeared to be incomplete in the response to the comments around staffing, “The report also commented upon how staff are stretched within

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-05-11	f	EDU	RPT	AM report Roehampton - MA MT - FT & PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

their resources as regard tutor time available but that they provide a very high standard of teaching. The [incomplete].” (response to Sutton 2009-2010). The visitors were concerned the programme team had not responded to the comments from the external examiner report and so the problem may still exist. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: The visitors suggest information relating to the external examiners comments and how the programme team has responded to these comments could be provided.

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided for this annual monitoring submission the external examiner report (Loth 2010-2011) some concerns around the communication of the mitigating circumstances procedures. The visitors have noted that a response to this report was not provided so are unable to determine how the programme team have responded to this concern. The visitors are concerned that the documentation is not clearly specifying requirements for the procedures around mitigating circumstances and so progression and achievement. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure this standard is met.

Suggested documentation: The visitors suggest information relating to the external examiners comments and how the programme team has responded to these comments could be provided.

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.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-05-11	f	EDU	RPT	AM report Roehampton - MA MT - FT & PT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section five: Visitors' comments

In reviewing the additional documentation provided the visitors were satisfied that the staffing resource for the programme ensures that the standards of education and training continue to be met. However, the visitors would like the education provider to note that while annual workload reviews are conducted and appropriate changes to staffing workloads are made there remains a concern that the staff delivering the programme are doing so at capacity. This has been highlighted in successive external examiners' reports. As such the visitors feel that the education provider should continue to be aware that if there were any reduction in staff numbers this may adversely affect the programmes ability to continue to meet the standards of education and training. Therefore, if the number of staff available to run the programme is reduced, the HPC should be notified through the major change process.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-05-11	f	EDU	RPT	AM report Roehampton - MA MT - FT & PT	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	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme title	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Jane Grant (Occupational therapist) Sarah Johnson (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	4 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided 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 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 are documents for one academic year only as this programme has only run for one of the two years for the current HPC audit cycle.

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.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-05-21	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Essex - MSc OT (Pre-reg) - 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	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme title	Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Occupational therapist
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Jane Grant (Occupational therapist) Sarah Johnson (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	4 May 2012

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided 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 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 are documents for one academic year only as this programme has only run for one of the two years for the current HPC audit cycle.

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.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2012-05-21	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Essex - Pg Dip OT (Pre-reg) - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None