

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bradford
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Date of visit</b>	3 – 4 May 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	5
Recommended outcome .....	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	12

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 28 June 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 27 July 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2011.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards – curriculum and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Laura Graham (Occupational therapist) Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	24
First approved intake	1 September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Beverly Lucas (University of Bradford)
Secretary	Laura Baxter (University of Bradford)
Members of the joint panel	Clair Parkin (College of Occupational Therapists) Sue Hutchings (College of Occupational Therapists) Deb Hearle (College of Occupational Therapists) Anna Clampin (College of Occupational Therapists) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational Therapists) Fiona MacVane (Internal panel member) Crina Oltean-Dumbrava (Internal

	panel member) Dean Harrington (Internal panel member) Donna Irving (Internal panel member) John Dermo (Internal panel member) Cilla Champaneria (Internal panel member) Julia Pansini-Murrell (Internal panel member) Lyn Westcott (External panel member)
--	--

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 47 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 10 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.**

**Condition:** The programme team must revisit programme documentation to clearly articulate how they will support students who may struggle with their English language ability.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated the admission criteria for entry to the programme included an English language GCSE grade C or equivalent or an appropriate International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score of 6.5, no element below 6 (SETs mapping document 2.2). The visitors noted that this potentially means there could be students on the programme who may struggle with their English language ability. In discussion with the programme team the visitors noted a number of resources which would be available to support a student struggling with language ability throughout the programme. The programme team identified courses and workshops held by the education providers' Language Centre to which they would encourage any student struggling with language to attend. The visitors noted the options available; however felt the information provided to students lacked detail. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit programme documentation (such as the programme handbooks) to clearly articulate what support is available for students who may be struggling with their English language ability.

### **4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The programme team must revisit programme documentation to clearly articulate how the programme will ensure students who struggle with their English language ability will meet SOP 1b.3 upon completion the programme.

- SOP 1b.3: be able to communicate in English to the standard equivalent to level 7 of the International English Language Testing System, with no element below 6.5

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated admission criteria for entry to the programme included a "GCSE English Language Grade C or equivalent" for those applying through UCAS (Universities & Colleges Admissions Service). International applicants must have achieved an International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score of "6.5 overall, with no element below 6" (SETs mapping document 2.2). The visitors were aware that upon admission to the HPC Register the applicant must be able to communicate to the standard of Level 7 of the IELTS with no element less than 6.5. The visitors were concerned with how the programme team would manage to ensure a student entering the programme with an IELTS score of 6.5 would be able to meet the relevant SOP upon completion of the programme.

In discussion with the programme team it was indicated there were a number of resources available held outside of the programme to support the student through the programme. The programme team identified optional courses and workshops held by the education providers' Language Centre to which they would encourage any student struggling with language to attend. The information about these additional resources was not included in the programme documentation for students.

The visitors were encouraged by these options available however considered there was the possibility that the optional courses or workshops would not be attended. The visitors considered it to be the programme teams' responsibility to ensure any issues with the students English language ability to be resolved and for the programme team to ensure the relevant SOP is met upon completion of the programme.

The visitors require further assurances from the programme team they will be ensuring all students meet the relevant SOP upon completion of the programme. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit programme documentation (such as the programme handbooks) to clearly articulate what support is available for English language ability difficulties and how they will ensure that upon completion of the programme SOP 1b.3 will be met.

### **5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of the mechanisms in place to approve and monitor role emerging placements that ensure the provision of a safe and supportive environment.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted the development of role emerging placements within the programme. The visitors also noted the importance of the role emerging placement as it incorporates all of the placement activity for year three of the programme and is therefore vital in ensuring students have the opportunity to develop the relevant proficiencies.

The visitors are satisfied that a robust auditing system is in place for the approval and monitoring of NHS placements and noted the discussions with the programme team outlining the plans to formalise similar arrangements for the approving and monitoring of role emerging placements. The visitors were not however provided with documentary evidence to support these discussions. The visitors therefore require evidence of the auditing process and the guidelines in place to ensure that the education provider can make a judgement on whether role emerging placements are of good quality and provide a safe and supportive environment.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of a thorough and effective system in place for approving and monitoring role emerging placements.



**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted the development of role emerging placements within the programme. The visitors also noted the importance of the role emerging placement as it incorporates all of the placement activity for year three of the programme and is therefore vital in ensuring students have the opportunity to develop the relevant proficiencies.

The visitors are satisfied that a robust auditing system is in place for the approval and monitoring of NHS placements and noted the discussions with the programme team outlining the plans to formalise similar arrangements for the approving and monitoring of role emerging placements. The visitors were not however provided with documentary evidence to support these discussions. The visitors therefore require clear written protocols that outline the systems in place to ensure that role emerging placements are approved and monitored in a thorough and effective way. Protocols might include evidence of policies and processes for approving role emerging placements and examples of how these are put into practice, details of systems for on-going monitoring and assessing placement providers, an explanation of how feedback from students is collected, analysed and acted on, details of how feedback is gained from practice placement educators and co-ordinators and evidence that shows the education provider ensures that there are clear and easy methods for communication between the parties. Evidence might also include details of how feedback is used to inform processes with copies of policies or details of processes provided for dealing with placement providers where difficulties arise.

#### **5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence outlining the systems used to ensure that role emerging placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted the development of role emerging placements within the programme. The visitors also noted the importance of the role emerging placement as it incorporates all of the placement activity for year three of the programme and is therefore vital in ensuring students have the opportunity to develop the relevant proficiencies.

The visitors are satisfied that a robust auditing system is in place for the approval and monitoring of NHS placements and noted the discussions with the programme team outlining the plans to formalise similar arrangements for the approving and monitoring of role emerging placements. The visitors were not however provided with documentary evidence to support these discussions. The visitors therefore require clear written protocols that outline the systems in place to ensure that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students.

## **5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence outlining the systems used to ensure that role emerging placement providers have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted the development of role emerging placements within the programme. The visitors also noted the importance of the role emerging placement as it incorporates all of the placement activity for year three of the programme and is therefore vital in ensuring students have the opportunity to develop the relevant proficiencies.

The visitors are satisfied that a robust auditing system is in place for the approval and monitoring of NHS placements and noted the discussions with the programme team outlining the plans to formalise similar arrangements for the approving and monitoring of role emerging placements. The visitors were not however provided with documentary evidence to support these discussions. The visitors therefore require clear written protocols that outline the systems in place to ensure that role emerging placement providers have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in the practice placement setting.

## **6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the assessment strategy and design to ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met standard of proficiency 1a.3 and 1a.4.

- 1a.3 - understand the importance of and be able to maintain confidentiality
- 1a.4 - understand the importance of and be able to obtain informed consent

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that students are able to pass an assessment despite breaching confidentiality within the assessment. The visitors were concerned that the current assessment criteria relating to confidentiality and informed consent may not ensure students understand the importance of confidentiality and the importance of obtaining informed consent and therefore demonstrate that they meet standard of proficiency 1a.3 and 1a.4. The visitors require the education provider to demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensures that students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency 1a.3 and 1a.4.

## **6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.**

**Condition:** The education provider must outline the changes that have been made to the Competency Based Framework assessment tool and provide a clear

rationale for the changes to ensure that the measurement of student performance is objective.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted comments within the external examiners' reports where it was noted that the marks students received in clinical modules were often higher than those received in non-clinical modules. Through discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the programme team were aware of potential discrepancies. The programme team informed the visitors that changes had been made to the Competency Based Framework assessment tool in an attempt to bring the marks students received in clinical modules closer in line to those received in non-clinical modules. The visitors therefore require evidence of the changes that have been made to the Competency Based Framework with a clear rationale for the changes to ensure that practice placement educators are able to measure student's performance in an objective way.

#### **6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the policy on aegrotat awards to state that they do not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register, and demonstrate how this information is clearly communicated to the students.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors found it difficult to determine the assessment regulations for the programme and how these are conveyed to students so that it is clear that aegrotat awards would not enable students to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that this standard is being met.

#### **6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. The visitors were happy that the current external examiner meets the requirement of the HPC. However this standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme must state that any external examiner appointed to the programme needs to be appropriately registered or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. Therefore the visitors require evidence that HPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the documentation, specifically in the programme regulations, to ensure that this standard is met.

## Recommendations

### **3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider developing a formal strategy to ensure that research development forms a key component of the programme teams continuing professional development activity.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team and senior management the visitors noted discussions around continuing professional development. The visitors noted discussions with the senior management team outlining that developing the programme team's learning and teaching qualifications had been a priority over recent years. The visitors note clear evidence of the programme team developing learning and teaching skills. The visitors note that the programme team may now like to consider developing a formal strategy to develop the programme team's research development to ensure that the programme team continue to develop the programme.

### **4.7 The delivery of the programme must encourage evidence based practice.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the way in which research evidence underpins assessment.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors clearly note that the programme team encourages evidence based practice through the delivery of the programme. The visitors noted strategies such as evidence based guidelines, research studies and literature reviews. The visitors did however note comments from an external examiner stating that 'student's weaknesses are that they do not use an extensive range of reading on which to base assignments'. The visitors would like the programme team to consider developing strategies to encourage students to further developing the use of theoretical knowledge to underpin their assessments. The visitors suggest that this could include research studies carried out but could also be from theoretical writing from experts in the field.

Laura Graham  
Claire Brewis

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bradford
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Radiographer
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Diagnostic radiography
<b>Date of visit</b>	10 – 11 May 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	5
Recommended outcome .....	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	11

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Radiographer' or 'Diagnostic radiographer' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 4 July 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 5 August 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 8 September 2011.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards – curriculum and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Richard Price (Diagnostic radiographer) Russell Hart (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	40
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2011
Chair	Beverly Lucas (University of Bradford)
Secretary	Laura Baxter (University of Bradford)
Members of the joint panel	Ian Henderson (Society / College of Radiographers) Fiona MacVane (Internal panel member) Rachael Sharples MacVane (Internal panel member) John Buckley MacVane (Internal panel member) Mike Cox MacVane (Internal panel member) Donna Irving MacVane (Internal panel member) Carol Higgison MacVane (Internal panel member) Margot McBride (External panel member)

	member
--	--------



## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 49 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 8 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly highlight that clinical proficiencies are assessed throughout the programme using the Clinical Portfolio and that the Clinical Portfolio is linked to the assessment of all profession specific modules, and therefore failure to complete the Clinical Portfolio will result in a student exiting the programme with no academic credit.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the Clinical Portfolio is linked to the assessment of profession specific modules and that failure of the Clinical Portfolio will result in failure of all profession specific modules. The visitors therefore note that failure of the Clinical Portfolio will result in a student exiting the programme with no academic credit. The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to clearly highlight that clinical proficiencies are assessed throughout the programme using the Clinical Portfolio and that the Clinical Portfolio is linked to the assessment of all profession specific modules. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that applicants are given the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

### **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that a system is in place for gaining students informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not find evidence of a formal consent procedure in place to mitigate any risk involved in students participating as service users in practical teaching. The visitors noted discussions with the programme team that outlined that students do not participate as service users in any practical or clinical teaching. The visitors also noted however, discussions with the programme team outlining the plans to introduce video sessions into the curriculum. The visitors therefore require evidence to show that there is a formal consent policy in place, how the education provider will apply this policy and how students are informed about this policy and their right to confidentiality.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to show how they effectively approve and monitor all practice placements.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted the visitors could not determine how the education provider approves and monitors all practice placements. The visitors noted discussions with the programme team that highlighted a system in place that utilises the Strategic Health Authority (SHA) audit tool. However, in order to ensure that this standard is met the visitors require the education provider to provide documentary evidence to formalise the policies and processes for approving placements and details of the systems for ongoing monitoring of placement providers. The visitors also noted discussion with the programme team highlighting that the education provider is utilising independent sector placements. The visitors also require information outlining if and how the education provider will utilise the SHA audit tool in the context of independent sector placements.

### **5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly articulate the mechanisms they use to ensure new practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training and are informed about the specifics of the programme in advance of receiving students.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team and practice placement educators the visitors noted that some practice placement educators were also clinical assessors, and to fulfil this role they had to undergo training provided by the education provider. The visitors also noted that a number of supervisors have completed a 'Support for learning and clinical practice' module offered by the education provider and accredited by the professional body. However, from discussion with the practice placement educators, the visitors noted that a number of practice placement educators present, who were not clinical assessors, had not received practice placement educator training prior to receiving students on placement. The visitors therefore require further evidence that articulates the mechanisms they use to ensure new practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training and are informed about the specifics of the programme in advance of receiving students.

### **5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the monitoring mechanism used to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered.

**Reason:** From the documents submitted and discussions with the programme team the visitors did not have sufficient evidence that the education provider has mechanisms in place to demonstrate that all practice placement educators are appropriately registered. The visitors require clarification on how the education provider records and monitors the registration status of its practice placement educators. The visitors also require clarification on the process and procedure in place if the education provider chooses to utilise practice placement educators who are not registered with the HPC. The visitors would require details on the mechanism in place to collect information about their experience, qualifications

and training relevant to the practice placement. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must review and clarify the programme assessment regulations to clearly specify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the Clinical Portfolio is linked to the profession specific modules and that failure of the Clinical Portfolio will result in failure of all profession specific modules. The visitors therefore note that failure of the Clinical Portfolio will result in a student exiting the programme with no academic credit.

The visitors also noted that the programme documentation makes reference to programme specific exit awards. The visitors require clarification of the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme given the fact that the Clinical Portfolio is linked to the profession specific modules and that failure of the Clinical Portfolio will result in failure of all profession specific modules. The visitors note that the link between the Clinical Portfolio and the assessment of the profession specific modules would therefore not allow students to leave the programme with a programme specific exit award.

The visitors finally noted discussions with the programme team where it was suggested that the Clinical Portfolio may be changed to link specific proficiencies to individual profession specific modules. The visitors note that this potential change will have an impact on the structure of the programme. The visitors therefore require details of the review of the programme assessment regulations and details of any changes to the structure of the Clinical Portfolio, should they occur.

#### **6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation regarding aegrotat awards and that this is clearly accessible to students.

#### **6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that one external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered and from the relevant part of the register unless alternate arrangements have been agreed.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. The visitors were satisfied that the current external examiner meets the requirement of the HPC. However this standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme must state that at least one external examiner appointed to the programme needs to be appropriately registered or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. Therefore the visitors require evidence that HPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the documentation, specifically in the programme regulations, to ensure that this standard is met.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider constructing and documenting a process that demonstrates how they guarantee and monitor the quality of teaching from specialist visiting lecturers.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team and practice placement educators the visitors could not determine a mechanism that is in place to record and monitor the quality of teaching of specialist visiting lecturers. The visitors suggest implementing a quality assurance system similar to that adopted for full time members of staff. The visitors felt that this could be used as a useful continuing professional development tool for specialist visiting lecturers and ensure that specific learning outcomes are delivered.

### **5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider developing a comprehensive strategy to ensure that all practice placement educators are clearly informed about the changes that have been made to the programme.

**Reason:** From discussions with the practice placement educators the visitors noted that all the practice placement educators present were aware of the changes that had taken place to the programme and had been consulted throughout the process. The visitors did however note discussions with the practice placement educators where it was stated that not all practice placement educators were aware of the changes to the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider considers developing a comprehensive strategy to ensure that all practice placement educators are clearly informed about the changes that have been made to the programme. One practice placement educator suggested developing a booklet to clarify the changes that have been made to the programme.

Richard Price  
Russell Hart

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Buckinghamshire New University
<b>Programme name</b>	Dip (HE) Operating Department Practitioner
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Date of visit</b>	9 – 10 June 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6



## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Operating department practitioner' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 25 July 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 29 July 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2011.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner) Mary Ann Elston (Lay visitor)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	15
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2011
Chair	John Boylan (Buckinghamshire New University)
Secretary	Sue Ball (Buckinghamshire New University)
Members of the joint panel	Jane Tyrer (Internal Panel Member) Ash Coles (Internal Panel Member) Paul Hennessey (External Panel Member) James Ellis (External Panel Member)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review any external examiners reports prior to the visit as the programme is new and there have been no external examiner reports produced.

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC met with students from the Dip HE Adult Nursing and Dip HE Mental Nurse Training programmes, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 49 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 8 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revise the admissions documentation to ensure that the applicant receives the correct information they require to take up the offer of a place on the programme.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of wrong terminology such as ‘...currently eligible to achieve HPC registration’. The visitors also noted the suggestion that the HPC sets certain expectations on practice placement hours which is incorrect and could cause confusion.

Also the documentation made reference to an enhanced criminal conviction check in the programme specification but only referred to criminal conviction checks elsewhere in the documentation which may cause confusion. The visitors were content that criminal conviction checks were taking place but were concerned about the confusion in the documentation.

With regard to the health checks the visitors saw there was no reference to the required Exposure Prone Procedures (EPP) (Department of Health guidance 2007) for students, which is particularly pertinent to operating department practitioners. Whilst they were content that the health checks were in place, the visitors wanted to be assured that prospective students were informed about the EPP requirements as if the student did not have confirmation that they had met the requirements for EPP then they might not be able to attend practice placements.

The visitors therefore require the admissions documentation to be thoroughly reviewed to ensure that the applicant has the information they require to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that there is adequate operating department practitioner experience within the staff cohort to deliver an effective programme.

**Reason:** From their reading of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors noted that currently there was only one operating department practitioner (ODP) on the staff for programme. In the meeting with the programme team the visitors were informed that whilst there was only one ODP currently in place there was a job advertisement for a senior lecturing post waiting approval for another member of staff to be in place by September. Also the Pro Vice Chancellor/Executive Dean and Dean of Students, Programmes & Quality of the faculty in which this

programme falls, stated in the same meeting that the ODPs would have the support of the department and faculty which was very experienced in delivery of similar programmes and that the staff in the department would be supporting the delivery of the programme during its establishment with the education provider. In order for the visitors to be assured that this standard is met they would like to receive revised documentation that clearly articulates how the education provider will ensure that sufficient appropriately qualified and experienced staff will be in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must evidence how the visiting lecturer system ensures that there is relevant knowledge and expertise in place to deliver the programme.

**Reason:** Further to the condition for SET 3.5, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that staff with relevant expertise and knowledge were in place for the delivery of the programme. At the meetings with the senior team and the programme team, the visitors were informed that staff from practice placement areas with the relevant knowledge and expertise would be teaching on the programme. The programme team said that this was a tried and trusted way of ensuring that students were taught by subject specialists and this ensured currency for key aspects of the curriculum. However the visitors were unclear as to how the programme team ensured that these external lecturers were appropriately trained to deliver key parts of the curriculum. In order to be assured that this standard is met the visitors would like to receive documentation that clearly indicates how the visiting lecturer system ensures that staff employed from practice placement areas, to deliver key parts of the programme, have the relevant expertise and knowledge.

### **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of appropriate protocols for student consent and also evidence of what systems would be in place if a student opted out of giving consent for any activity.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not find evidence of a formal consent procedure in place to mitigate any risk involved in students participating as service users in practical teaching. If no formal policy for obtaining consent is in place students may feel they are treated differently in different situations and lodge academic appeals because of this. This in turn could lead to students completing the course being unable to meet all of the relevant HPC standards of proficiency (SOPs).

The visitors discussed this with the programme team, and it became clear that there was a consent process in place for the nursing programmes which could be revised to be fit for purpose for ODP students.

The visitors therefore require evidence of appropriate protocols for student consent and evidence of what systems would be in place if a student opted out of giving consent for any activity.

#### **4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly articulate within the programme outcomes where practice skills in the surgical phase are addressed, in order for the standards of proficiency to be met.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit it was not clear where students would learn about being a scrubs practitioner within the practice skills for the surgical phase of the programme. In the meeting with the programme team the visitors discussed these practice skills and noted the programme team considered that the scrubs element of the surgical phase was an essential element of the programme. The programme team also highlighted that while it was an essential element of the programme it may not have been articulated fully in the programme documentation. The visitors therefore require additional information to be included in the programme documentation to be assured that these practice skills in the surgical phase are addressed. In this way the visitors can be sure that successful students' meet all of the standards of proficiency for their part of the register and that the programme can meet this standard.

#### **4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.**

**Condition:** The education provider must review the programme documentation to include reference to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted there were various references to HPC codes or standards but the correct title of HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) was not listed. The visitors felt that to further embed the SCPEs in the teaching and learning they should be referenced, where applicable, to conduct and ethics matters in the programme in order to direct students to the standards that HPC expects of them once they have joined the profession. This is to ensure that students are aware, and understand the implications of the HPC SCPEs. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be reviewed to include reference to the standards.

#### **5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly articulate the range of placements that students have to undertake to complete the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in their reading of the documentation prior to the visit that not all the placements that supported the delivery of the learning outcomes

for the programme were listed. In the meeting with the programme team the visitors discussed placements and asked about mandatory placements. The team reported that all placements listed as mandatory by the professional body needed to be completed by students to successfully complete the programme. There was a process in place to ensure that students would take all placements and if there was to be an issue then the practice placement co-ordinator would seek to resolve the issue and ensure that the student would receive the relevant placements listed as mandatory. In order for the visitors to be assured that this standard is met they require documentation that clearly identifies the mandatory range of placements that have to be completed by students to ensure they are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

**6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly articulate within the programme outcomes where practice skills in the surgical phase are addressed within the assessment strategy and design to ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

**Reason:** From the visitors reading of the documentation prior to the visit it was not clear where students would learn about being a scrubs practitioner within the practice skills for the surgical phase of the programme. In the meeting with the programme team the visitors discussed these practice skills and noted the programme team considered that the scrubs element of the surgical phase was an essential element of the programme. The programme team also highlighted that while it was an essential element of the programme it may not have been articulated fully in the programme documentation where it was delivered and assessed. The visitors therefore require additional information to be included in the programme documentation to be assured that these practice skills in the surgical phase are addressed and assessed appropriately. In this way the visitors can be sure that successful students' meet all of the standards of proficiency for their part of the register and that the programme can meet this standard.

Penny Joyce  
Julie Weir  
Mary Ann Elston



## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Essex
<b>Programme name</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	24 – 25 May 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Clinical psychologist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 5 July 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 29 July 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2011.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner psychologist profession came onto the register in July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider re-validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Annie Mitchell (Clinical psychologist) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	10
First approved intake	1 January 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Pam Cox (Essex University)
Secretary	Kirstie Sceats (Essex University)
Members of the joint panel	Martin Colley (Internal panel member) Tim Rakow (Internal panel member) Murray Warren (Internal panel member) Anna Orchard (Internal panel member) Eve Knight (British Psychological Society) Andrew Cuthbertson (British Psychological Society) Andrew Vidgen (British Psychological Society) Aimee Hayter (British Psychological Society) Molly Ross (British Psychological Society)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme.

Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly state in the information provided to applicants what the requirements for successful application to the programme are.

**Reason:** Having scrutinised the programme documentation the visitors were satisfied the programme applied selection and entry criteria to ensure that successful applicants have a good command of reading, writing and spoken English. The visitors were also satisfied that the programme does not accredit prior experiential learning (APEL). However, the visitors could only identify a clear statement regarding the APEL policy in programme's rules of assessment, not in the information provided to applicants or in the advertising materials. It was also the case that the programme stated different English language proficiency requirement in the programme documentation and the school prospectus. As this requirement, and the policy regarding APEL was not clearly articulated to applicants, this could lead to an applicant successfully appealing a decision not allow them entry onto the programme. Therefore the visitors require the programme team to provide a clear statement regarding the APEL policy and to consistently state the proficiency of English an applicant would have to demonstrate in order to successfully apply to the programme. This will ensure that a potential applicant will have all of the information they require to make an informed choice about applying and taking up an offer of a place on this programme.

### **5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**

**Condition:** The education provider must articulate how they ensure that practice placement educators understand what their role as supervisor on this programme entails.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, and in discussion at the visit, the visitors were clear that practice placement educators were experienced clinicians and the majority were registered as clinical psychologists with the HPC. They also noted that the programme team recorded what training practice placement educators had undertaken and that educators were provided with comprehensive programme specific documentation. However, it was clear that additional training was not seen as mandatory for practice placement educators new to the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear as to how the programme team ensured that practice placement educators new to the programme were appropriately oriented to the requirements of this particular programme. This could lead to students perceiving that they may have been disadvantaged due to differences in placement experience. In turn students could utilise the academic appeals process to contest placement outcomes which could lead to students completing the course even if the programme team have concerns over their fitness to practice. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate

how the programme team ensure that practice placement educators understand what trainees on the programme require from their placement experience and how to assess this experience. This is to ensure that there is as much equality of student experience and assessment as possible across all practice placements and that this standard continues to be met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly state in the programme documentation that where there are variations, the programme's rules of assessment supersede those of the university.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the programme documentation that there were some inconsistencies between the programme specific rules of assessment and some of the university regulations. After discussion with the programme team it was clarified that for the level 8 modules, which cover the majority of the programme, the programme specific rules of assessment supersede the university regulations where there are variations between the two. While the visitors were satisfied that this was the case they were not clear as to how the programme documentation clearly articulated these arrangements to students. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the students on the programme are made aware of the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme and which rules or regulations apply at which points. This will ensure that students understand what is required of them to successfully complete the programme and that this standard continues to be met.

#### **6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the register unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy specific to the programme. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements for the programme but need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider continued monitoring of the staffing levels for the programme to ensure there is an adequate number of staff available to deliver the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided and in discussion at the visit the visitors were satisfied that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme. Therefore they were satisfied that the programme continues to meet this standard. However, from discussions with the senior team and the programme team the visitors were made aware of the pressures on staffing levels due to the current financial climate in which the education provider is operating. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider continues to monitor the staffing levels on the programme to ensure the continuity of administrative support to staff and practice placement providers. The education provider should also consider increasing the ability of the programme team to flexibly recruit temporary members of staff to cover periods of high activity. In this way the education provider can hopefully maintain the administrative support for the programme, which was widely praised, and provide the programme team with the flexibility to deal with periods of high activity or temporary reductions in staffing.

### **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider moving the point at which the programme team gains student consent for participation in practical and clinical teaching.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the programme team gained students consent for participation in practical and clinical teaching at the interview stage of the application process. The visitors therefore felt that this standard was met. However, the visitors did highlight that while there was a process in place applicants may feel as though they had to give their consent as they had not yet secured a place on the programme, despite being informed that this was not the case. The visitors therefore strongly recommend that the programme team consider gaining students consent for participation in practical and clinical teaching after they have been accepted and have taken up a place on the programme. This could be instead of gaining students consent at interview or in addition to this process. In this way the programme team would avoid any unnecessary pressure which applicants may feel during the interview process to give their consent for participation in practical and clinical teaching.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider including placement monitoring in the mid-placement reviews.



**Reason:** From the information provided prior to the visit and, in discussion with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that the programme team maintains an effective system for approving and monitoring all placements. Therefore the visitors feel that the programme continues to meet this standard. However, in discussion with the students it was noted that the mid-placement visits, which take place for each placement, only concentrated on the achievement of the student. The visitors felt that this was an opportunity to address any issues in relation to the resources provided by the practice placement. Therefore the visitors recommend that the programme team includes elements of placement monitoring into the mid-placement visits. In this way the programme team can ensure that sufficient resources are available to students while on placement and thereby enhance the existing system for monitoring placements.

**5.13 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider continuing the work being undertaken to encompass the development of formal mechanisms for the inclusion of service users in key elements of the programme.

**Reason:** From discussions at the visit the visitors noted that a range of teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users were in place throughout the practice placements. Therefore the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met. However, the programme team highlighted that work was being done to integrate service users and carers into key elements of the programme and that this work was ongoing. The visitors recommend that the programme team continue this work and consider setting up formal mechanisms to include service users in the planning and operation of some elements of the programme. They also recommend that the programme team utilise the well-developed service user resources and provision in place at the university and the work being undertaken at their partner NHS trusts. In combination with utilising the national good practice on the involvement of service users in clinical psychology education, this will allow the programme to integrate service users and carers fully into the programme.

Annie Mitchell  
David Packwood

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Lincoln
<b>Programme name</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	12 – 13 May 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	5
Recommended outcome .....	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Clinical psychologist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 6 July 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 16 September 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 6 December 2011.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner psychology profession came onto the register in July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The programme is delivered and validated in collaboration between two education providers. This visit assessed the programme delivered at the University of Lincoln and at the University of Nottingham. A separate report exists for the programme delivered and validated at University of Nottingham.

The professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report produced by the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Laura Golding (Clinical psychologist) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	19 per cohort shared between the two education provider delivery sites
First approved intake	September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Todd Hogue (University of Lincoln)
Secretary	Alison Wilson (University of Lincoln)
Members of the joint panel	Helen Combes (British Psychological Society) Alison Gold (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society) Robert Knight (British Psychological Society) Adrian Neal (British Psychological Society)

	Graham Pratt (British Psychological Society)
--	--

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supplementary documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC reviewed the External Examiners' reports for 2009-2010 prior to the visit. The HPC did not review the External Examiners' reports for 2008-2009 prior to the visit, however, they were provided at the visit itself.

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 48 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 9 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **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.**

**Condition:** The programme team must revisit programme documentation and advertising materials, including the websites, to include information about accreditation of prior learning (APEL or APL) policies for the programme.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussions at the visit confirmed that the programme has no provision for accreditation of prior learning (APEL or APL) policies for entry to the programme. The documentation included the clearing house entry website (document A) as programme advertising materials. The clearing house entry website is used for a number of clinical psychology programmes from different course centres across England and Wales. In the entry requirements on the clearing house entry website there was no information that clearly stated APEL or APL policies were not applicable for this programme.

Each education provider delivering this programme has its own website materials for the programme. The information on the education provider's website page for this programme did not state that APEL or APL policies could not be used for this programme. The tender document provided (document T) was the only document which stated there was no provision for APL or APEL policies for this programme.

The visitors were satisfied that the programme does not use APEL or APL policies but were aware this information should be communicated clearly for all potential applicants for the programme. The information should be placed in as many areas as necessary to ensure potential applicants have access to this information. The visitors therefore require advertising materials (the individual education provider's programme website and the clearing house entry website) and programme documentation (such as the programme handbook) to be revised to include this information to ensure that potential applicants have all the information they need to make an informed choice on whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

### **3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.**

**Condition:** The programme team must revise programme documentation to clearly articulate all aspects of the students' complaints processes for trainees.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit included the two education provider's formal students' complaints procedures for the programme and the programme handbook. Discussions with the trainees highlighted they were aware the two education providers had student complaints procedures but were uncertain if there were any set procedures which allowed them to contact the programme team to discuss any problems on an informal basis prior to initiating their own education provider's students' complaints procedure. The visitors noted the formal student complaints procedures for both education



providers included statements surrounding informal resolutions (Document F, p2 and Document G, p3). The visitors also noted the programme handbook included information about the fitness to practise procedures but did not include the students' complaints procedures. The visitors considered information regarding the informal resolution of any issues to be important information alongside the formal students' complaints procedure information. The visitors suggest the programme team include information about the informal resolution procedures for trainees in the programme handbook and supplement this information with links to the two education providers' formal complaints procedures in order that trainees can find the information pertinent to their 'base' education provider. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise programme documentation to ensure all aspects of the students' complaints processes are clearly articulated for trainees.

### **3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to ensure there are appropriate fitness to practise procedures for the programme, in light of the two delivery sites and the need for equitable regulations.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit included information about the fitness to practise procedures in place for the programme. The visitors noted concerns had been raised in the education provider's response to the external examiners reports 2009-2010, "trainees who have been judged as failing to meet standards of professional practice ...[were] allowed to continue on the programme following university appeals processes" (p25). Discussion with the programme team indicated the education providers jointly running and delivering the programme have two separate university fitness to practise and appeals procedures which do not take full account of the nature of the separate education providers' procedures. As a result there was the fitness to practise incident noted by the external examiner where a trainee failed an aspect of the programme, instigated extenuating circumstances procedures and had allowances made for them. The trainee then subsequently failed the same aspect of the programme. They then were able to go through processes which did not take account of the extenuating circumstances and so were allowed to remain on the programme.

This concerned the visitors as it indicated that the fitness to practise procedures may not be fit for purpose for this programme. Discussions with the programme team indicated this was a problem they were aware of. The programme must have an equitable process for trainees given the two sites for the programme. The visitors suggest the development of joint fitness to practise and appeal regulations which override the individual education provider regulations be the most appropriate solution for this problem. The visitors also suggest looking at the condition for SET 6.10 alongside this condition as they are closely linked. The fitness to practise procedures should identify and address concerns and allow for an appropriate range of outcomes. The process used must be appropriate to the clinical nature of the programme and the delivery of the programme academically and through placements. The visitors therefore require evidence to ensure there is an appropriate fitness to practise procedure for the

programme, in light of the two delivery sites and the need for equitable regulations.

### **5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of how they ensure all placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit included the placement contract, details that the clinical supervisors have undertaken training and general information regarding clinical supervisors at placements. The visitors considered these to be useful in showing how the trainees are supported at placement. However they judged there to be not enough evidence to show how the education provider ensures the placement settings are safe and supportive environments for trainees. There was no evidence of any risk assessments undertaken or how health and safety policies and procedures are monitored at placement settings. The programme team must maintain overall responsibility for each placement including ensuring the placement setting provides a safe and supportive environment. The visitors were concerned there was no formal method for the programme team to ensure the placement environments are safe and supportive for the trainees. The visitors suggest a method be incorporated into the programmes placement approval and monitoring systems. The visitors suggest conditions for SETs 5.4, 5.6, 5.7 and 5.8 be looked at alongside this condition as they are closely linked. The visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence of how they ensure all placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of how they maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit detailed the placement structures for the programme. There are three NHS trusts which provide placements for the programme. It was stated that “monitoring and ensuring the quality of practice learning is handled jointly by the Supervisors Subcommittee and by the Senior Clinical Tutors who work closely with supervisors and local service heads / managers to ensure both trainee and service needs are met as far as possible” (Document T, 6.7.6 Monitoring the quality of practice learning).

In discussion at the visit it was indicated the system used for monitoring the placements was via the placement reviews and the Trainee’s Evaluation of Placement form. The visitors note that monitoring of this kind would only explore the trainees’ placement experience and would not be appropriate to explore each individual placement’s qualities and management of the placement. The programme team must maintain overall responsibility for each placement

including the management of a formal system to approve and monitor practice placements against criteria set by the programme team.

The visitors are aware that the placements currently used have been involved with the programme for some time. They are also aware that there may be instances when new placements need to be sourced. The visitors were concerned there was no formal system for the education provider to approve and then regularly monitor new placements in order to maintain the safe and supportive environment for the trainees. The approval and monitoring systems can also affect SETs 5.3, 5.6, 5.7 and 5.8 so visitors suggest looking at these conditions together. The visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence of how they maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

#### **5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of how they ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit included the placement contract, a list of clinical supervisors and general information regarding clinical supervisors at placements. The visitors considered these to be useful indicators that the education provider was aware of the need to monitor clinical supervisors. However they judged there to be not enough evidence to show how the programme team ensures there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting. There was no evidence that information regarding other staff at the placement setting who could be involved with the trainees' learning was taken into account.

The programme team must maintain overall responsibility for each placement including ensuring there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement settings. The visitors were concerned there was no formal method for the education provider to ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement settings. The visitors suggest this be incorporated into the programmes placement approval and monitoring systems. The visitors suggest the conditions for SETs 5.3, 5.4, 5.7 and 5.8 be looked at alongside this standard as they are closely linked. The visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence of how they ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

#### **5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of how they ensure the clinical supervisors have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit included the placement contract, a list of clinical supervisors and general information regarding clinical supervisors at placements. The visitors considered these to be useful indicators the education provider was aware of the need to monitor clinical supervisors however judged there to not be enough evidence to show how the programme team ensures the clinical supervisors have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience required to work with trainees. There was no evidence that information regarding clinical supervisors' knowledge, skills and experience was required by the programme team.

The programme team must maintain overall responsibility for each placement including ensuring the clinical supervisors at the placement settings have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to work with the trainees. The visitors were concerned there was no formal method for the programme team to ensure clinical supervisors have the appropriate knowledge, skills and experience to work with trainees. The visitors suggest this be incorporated into the programmes placement approval and monitoring systems. The visitors suggest the conditions for SETs 5.3, 5.4, 5.6 and 5.8 be looked at alongside this standard as they are closely linked. The visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence of how they ensure the clinical supervisors at the placement settings have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to work with the trainees.

#### **5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**

**Condition:** The programme team must ensure clinical supervisors undertake appropriate practice educator training prior to working with trainees.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussions at the visit indicated there were arrangements for training sessions held for the clinical supervisors of this programme. In discussion at the visit it was indicated it was expected that a clinical supervisor undertake the training prior to working with trainees however it was not clear that this was a mandatory requirement. The visitors received a list of clinical supervisors as part of the evidence this standard was met however there was no indication the training undertaken by the supervisors was recorded. The programme team must maintain overall responsibility for each placement including ensuring training of some form has taken place prior to undertaking work with the trainee. The visitors were concerned there was no formal method for the programme team to ensure clinical supervisors had undertaken some form of initial training prior to working with the trainees. The visitors suggest this be incorporated into the programmes placement approval and monitoring systems. The visitors suggest the conditions for SETs 5.3, 5.4, 5.6 and 5.7 be looked at alongside this standard as they are closely linked. The visitors require further evidence that the programme team have ensured the clinical supervisors have undertaken appropriate training prior to working with trainees.

## **6.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for a procedure for the right of appeal for students.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to ensure the procedures for the right of appeal and extenuating circumstances for the programme are appropriate, in light of the two delivery sites and the need for equitable regulations.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit included information about the right of appeal and extenuating circumstances procedures that were in place for the programme. The visitors noted concerns had been raised in the education provider's response to the external examiners reports 2009-2010, "trainees who have been judged as failing to meet standards of professional practice ... [were] allowed to continue on the programme following university appeals processes" (p25). Discussion with the programme team indicated the education providers jointly running and delivering the programme have two separate university appeals procedures which do not take full account of the nature of the separate education provider processes. As a result there was the instance noted by the external examiner where a trainee failed an aspect of the programme, instigated extenuating circumstances procedures and had allowances made for them. The trainee then subsequently failed the same aspect of the programme. They then were able to go through the appeals processes which did not take account of the extenuating circumstances and so were allowed to remain on the programme.

This concerned the visitors as it indicated the right to appeal and extenuating circumstances procedures may not be fit for purpose for this programme. Discussions with the programme team indicated this was a problem they were aware of. The programme must have an equitable process which takes into account the differing processes given the two education provider sites for the programme. The visitors suggest the development of joint extenuating circumstances and appeal regulations which override the individual education provider regulations be the most appropriate solution for this problem. The visitors suggest looking at the condition for SET 3.16 alongside this condition as they are closely linked. The processes used must be appropriate to the clinical nature of the programme and the delivery of the programme. The visitors require further evidence to ensure the procedures for the right of appeal and extenuating circumstances for the programme are appropriate, in light of the two delivery sites and the need for equitable regulations.

## Recommendations

### **4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.**

**Recommendation:** The programme team may wish to consider incorporating references and links to all HPC publications that are suitable for trainees in the programme documentation where it is appropriate.

**Reason:** From discussion at the visit and programme documentation seen, the visitors were satisfied this standard was met and that the HPC featured strongly as part of the trainees' learning. The visitors noticed from the programme handbook and the module indicative reading lists there were publications available from the HPC which were not referenced but which could be used to supplement learning. The visitors suggest that by including website links to the publications where appropriate, the trainees' knowledge of the HPC will be broadened and they will remain up to date with the current regulatory status. The visitors suggest publications such as Your guide to our standards for continuing professional development, Guidance on conduct and ethics for students and Guidance on health and character could be cited in several places. The visitors additionally felt website links to the Standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the Standards of proficiency for practitioner psychologists could be more strongly referenced through the documents. The visitors feel the incorporation of more links to the HPC publications would further embed the HPC within the programme and strengthen the learning experience.

### **5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**

**Recommendation:** The programme team may wish to consider ways to further strengthen the advertising used for clinical supervisors' secondary 'refresher' training sessions.

**Reason:** From discussion at the visit, the visitors noted there had been some difficulties in keeping clinical supervisors informed of the 'refresher' training sessions available. It was noted there had been some changes to the management of the training sessions recently and as a result there was some confusion as to when and where the sessions were being held. The visitors were satisfied 'refresher' training was held regularly however felt there could be other means of advertising the availability of training sessions. The visitors suggest measures such as creating an online advertising website space, sending regular email updates for available sessions or ensuring training is mentioned by the clinical tutor at the clinical visits. The visitors feel by strengthening the clinical supervisors' awareness of training sessions this would encourage attendance.

Laura Golding  
David Packwood

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	London Metropolitan University
<b>Programme name</b>	MSc Dietetics and Nutrition (Formerly MSc Human Nutrition and Dietetics)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Dietitian
<b>Date of visit</b>	17 – 18 May 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	9

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Dietitian' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 19 July 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 29 July 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2011.



## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the Post Graduate Diploma in Dietetics and Nutrition. The professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	10
First approved intake	7 January 2002
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Bob Gilchrist (London Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Mohbub Uddin (London Metropolitan University)
Members of the joint panel	Susan Shandley (British Dietetic Association)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit all programme documentation including advertising materials to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of current statutory regulation.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the programme documentation that there were several instances of incorrect or out of date terminology in reference to the current environment of statutory regulation. They highlighted that on a number of occasions the HPC was referred to as accrediting the programme. The HPC approves programmes and does not offer accreditation. There were also instances where the term “state registration” was used. Again this is no longer part of the terminology within statutory regulation. The use of this language may mislead applicants and not provide them with sufficient information to make an informed decision about whether to take up a place on the programme. The visitors therefore require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

### **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Condition:** The education provider must implement formal protocols to obtain consent when students participate as service users to ensure consent is obtained.

**Reason:** In the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping received prior to the visit the visitors noted that they were referred to student employment policies via a website. From this information the visitors were unclear if any appropriate protocols were being used to ensure that students gave consent to participate as service users.

In the meeting with the students, the students said they had participated in role play as patients as part of the programme. However the students had no recollection of signing any document or protocol giving their consent to take part in role play or similar activity.

In the meeting with the programme team the visitors discussed what the students had said. The programme team said they did not have any protocols or forms that the students complete to take part in role play and similar activity. The team considered that by signing up to do the programme then the students were consenting to any participant activity, although there was no section in the admissions form that asked students to sign giving consent to participate in role play or similar activity.

In light of this, the visitors were not satisfied the programme gained informed consent from students or could appropriately manage situations where students

declined to participate in the practical and clinical teaching once on the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to implement formal protocols for obtaining consent from students (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme) and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching (such as alternative learning arrangements).

**4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revise the programme module descriptors to make explicit how the learning outcomes of the programme allow students to meet the following standard of proficiency (SOP);

- **1a.1 be able to practise within the legal and ethical boundaries of their profession**
  - **understand what is required of them by the Health Professions Council**

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were unclear as to how the above standard of proficiency was met within the module descriptors.

In discussions with the programme team the visitors were informed that professionalism and the legal and ethical aspects of the profession were a theme that ran through all the modules throughout the programme. The team also said that by completing the portfolio the students would also learn about professionalism and the legal and ethical aspects of the profession. The visitors were satisfied with this explanation but could not see how this translated in the documentation.

In order for the visitors to be assured that this standard is met they would like to receive revised documentation that clearly articulates how the standard of proficiency is met.

**6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must review the module descriptors to make explicit that where the learning outcomes allow students to meet the following standard of proficiency, and that they are adequately assessed;

- **1a.1 be able to practise within the legal and ethical boundaries of their profession**
  - **understand what is required of them by the Health Professions Council**

**Reason:** As in SET 4.1, from the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were unclear as to how the above standard of proficiency was met within the module descriptors.

In discussions with the programme team the visitors were informed that professionalism and the legal and ethical aspects of the profession were a theme that ran through all the modules throughout the programme. The team also said that by completing the portfolio the students would also learn about professionalism and the legal and ethical aspects of the profession. The visitors were satisfied with this explanation but could not see how this translated in the documentation.

The visitors were therefore unclear about how the SOP was met and how the learning outcomes ensure that students completing the programme can meet the relevant standard of proficiency. The visitors therefore require the programme team to demonstrate within the programme documentation how the learning outcomes are assessed thereby ensuring that students can meet this SOP when completing the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly specify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that in the programme documentation the statement in the module descriptors that 'Students must be assessed on all learning outcomes to meet the requirements of the British Dietetic Association and Health Professions Council.'

The visitors discussed this with the programme team as the Health Professions Council does not state this requirement. The requirement of the HPC is that the assessment regulations must clearly specify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme and that the assessment strategy and design must ensure that a student who successfully completes the programme has met the standard of proficiency.

The programme team reported that this had been included to ensure that students knew that everything had to be passed in order to progress and complete the programme. However the team did say that the pass mark was 50% which was the education provider's assessment regulation and that this applied across all components of the modules. There was no compensation for any component within any of the modules.

The visitors considered that it could be misleading by making reference to the Health Professions Council and not clearly stating the assessment regulations for progression through the programme. Therefore the visitors require revised documentation that clearly specifies the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

## Recommendations

**6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider the titles for the fall back awards to make sure that any possible reference to an HPC protected title is negated in the assessment regulations for the programme.

**Reason:** Whilst the visitors were happy that this standard had been met, they considered that the programme team might want to consider the title for the fall back award being Post graduate Certificate in Diet and Health Studies. Whilst the title is not directly part of an HPC protected title, it could lead to misunderstanding by the public and possibly students on the programme as to whether this title could be used and therefore whether someone holding this qualification could work within the profession. The visitors wanted to make the programme team aware of this potential misunderstanding.

Alison Nicholls  
Fiona McCullough

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	London Metropolitan University
<b>Programme name</b>	Post Graduate Diploma Dietetics and Nutrition (Pre-registration) (Formerly Pg Dip in Human Nutrition and Dietetics)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Dietitian
<b>Date of visit</b>	17 – 18 May 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	9



## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Dietitian' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 19 July 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 29 July 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2011.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the Post Graduate Diploma in Dietetics and Nutrition. The professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Alison Nicholls (Dietitian) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	10
First approved intake	7 January 2002
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Bob Gilchrist (London Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Mohbub Uddin (London Metropolitan University)
Members of the joint panel	Susan Shandley (British Dietetic Association)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit all programme documentation including advertising materials to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of current statutory regulation.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the programme documentation that there were several instances of incorrect or out of date terminology in reference to the current environment of statutory regulation. They highlighted that on a number of occasions the HPC was referred to as accrediting the programme. The HPC approves programmes and does not offer accreditation. There were also instances where the term “state registration” was used. Again this is no longer part of the terminology within statutory regulation. The use of this language may mislead applicants and not provide them with sufficient information to make an informed decision about whether to take up a place on the programme. The visitors therefore require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

### **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Condition:** The education provider must implement formal protocols to obtain consent when students participate as service users to ensure consent is obtained.

**Reason:** In the standards of education (SETs) mapping received prior to the visit the visitors noted that they were referred to student employment policies via a website. From this information the visitors were unclear if any appropriate protocols were being used to ensure that students gave consent to participate as service users.

In the meeting with the students, the students said they had participated in role play as patients as part of the programme. However the students had no recollection of signing any document or protocol giving their consent to take part in role play or similar activity.

In the meeting with the programme team the visitors discussed what the students had said. The programme team said they did not have any protocols or forms that the students complete to take part in role play and similar activity. The team considered that by signing up to do the programme then the students were consenting to any participant activity, although there was no section in the admissions form that asked students to sign giving consent to participate in role play or similar activity.

In light of this, the visitors were not satisfied the programme gained informed consent from students or could appropriately manage situations where students

declined to participate in the practical and clinical teaching once on the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to implement formal protocols for obtaining consent from students (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme) and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching (such as alternative learning arrangements).

**4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revise the programme module descriptors to make explicit how the learning outcomes of the programme allow students to meet the following standard of proficiency (SOPs);

- **1a.1 be able to practise within the legal and ethical boundaries of their profession**
  - **understand what is required of them by the Health Professions Council**

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were unclear as to how the above standard of proficiency was met within the module descriptors.

In discussions with the programme team the visitors were informed that professionalism and the legal and ethical aspects of the profession was a theme that ran through all the modules throughout the programme. The team also said that by completing the portfolio the students would also learn about professionalism and the legal and ethical aspects of the profession. The visitors were satisfied with this explanation, but could not see how this translated in the documentation.

In order for the visitors to be assured that this standard is met they would like to receive revised documentation that clearly articulates how the standard of proficiency is met.

**6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must review the module descriptors to make explicit that where the learning outcomes allow students to meet the following HPC standard of proficiency, and that they are adequately assessed;

- **1a.1 be able to practise within the legal and ethical boundaries of their profession**
  - **understand what is required of them by the Health Professions Council**

**Reason:** As in SET 4.1 from the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were unclear as to how the above standard of proficiency was met within the module descriptors.

In discussions with the programme team the visitors were informed that the professionalism and legal and ethical aspects of the profession was a theme that ran through all the modules throughout the programme. The team also said that by completing the portfolio the students would also learn about professionalism and the legal and ethical aspects of the profession. The visitors were satisfied with this explanation, but could not see how this translated in the documentation.

The visitors were therefore unclear about how the SOP was met and how the learning outcomes ensure that students completing the programme can meet the relevant standards of proficiency. The visitors therefore require the programme team to demonstrate within the programme documentation how the learning outcomes are assessed thereby ensuring that students can meet this SOP when completing the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly specify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that in the programme documentation the statement in module descriptors that “Students must be assessed on all learning outcomes to meet the requirements of the British Dietetic Association and Health Professions Council.”

The visitors discussed this with the programme team meeting that the Health Professions Council does not state any such requirements. The requirement of the HPC is that the assessment regulations must clearly specify the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme. As well as students meeting all the SOPs.

The programme team reported that this had been included to ensure that students knew that everything had to be passed in order to progress and complete the programme. However the team did say that in fact the pass mark was 50% which was the education provider’s assessment regulation and that this applied across all components of the modules. There was no compensation for any component within any of the modules.

The visitors considered that this was misleading by making reference to the Health Professions Council. Therefore the visitors require revised documentation that clearly specifies the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

## Recommendations

**6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider the titles for the fall back awards to make sure that any possible reference to an HPC protected title is negated in the assessment regulations for the programme.

**Reason:** Whilst the visitors were happy that this standard had been met, they considered that the programme team might want to consider the title for the fall back award being Post graduate Certificate in Diet and Health Studies. Whilst the title is not directly part of an HPC protected title, it could lead to misunderstanding by the public and possibly students on the programme as to whether this title could be used and therefore someone holding this qualification could work within the profession. The visitors wanted to make the programme team aware of this potential misunderstanding.

Alison Nicholls  
Fiona McCullough



## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	London South Bank University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Date of visit</b>	15 – 17 June 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	10

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Operating department practitioner' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 August 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 16 September 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 October 2011.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - DipHE Operating Department Practice, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Pg Dip Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography and Pg Dip Therapeutic Radiography.

The professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, the professional bodies, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Nick Clark (Operating department practitioner) Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	30
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2012
Chair	Holly Nicholas (London South Bank University)
Secretary	Catherine Moss (London South Bank University)
Members of the joint panel	Lisa Greatrex (Internal Panel Member) Helen Booth (College of Operating Department Practice)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Additional information about programmes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there are no external examiner reports' because the programme is new.

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC met with students from the DipHE Operating Department Practice programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they will monitor and evaluate the management of placement setting allocations.

**Reason:** In discussion with students from the DipHE Operating department practice programme at the visit the visitors noted that it was possible for a student to be placed in a practice setting without having had any theoretical teaching about that setting beforehand. This model of practice placement setting allocation which will be used for this programme means that it will be the responsibility of the practice educator to manage the allocation of placement settings. The visitors also noted that the practice placement educator was not always aware of what theoretical teaching a student had undertaken before undertaking placement. From these discussions the visitors were assured that this was an intermittent issue that did not occur with one particular required setting or with one particular placement provider. However, it is the programme teams' responsibility to support students through the programme and for the programme team to monitor and subsequently act appropriately on any student feedback. The visitors considered this to be particularly important in light of the potential for differing students' experiences of placement setting management and the need to maintain parity of placement experience across the cohorts. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team will monitor the management of placement setting allocation. In this way the visitors can be sure that there will be no repeated instances of theoretical learning following placements occurring and that there will be a parity of student placement experience across all cohorts.

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence of how the programme specific information, provided in the placement handbook, will be effectively used.

**Reason:** In the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors noted the practice placement handbook (Document H, Appendix 4). The handbook was generic to all of the programmes within the Interprofessional Scheme in Allied Health Professions (IPSAH). From their reading of the handbook the visitors were satisfied that the generic programme material was complete. However, the section designed to contain the specific material for this programme was incomplete (Section 3, p37). The visitors therefore could not determine where information, specific to this programme, would be provided to students. The conditions against SETs 3.3, 4.3 and 5.11 can be looked at alongside this standard as they will help the programme team consider the relevant information the visitors wish to see. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide further evidence as to how the programme specific information in the placement handbook will be effectively used.

#### **4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence that clearly demonstrates the requirements of the programme team, the practice educators and the students in terms of ensuring the theoretical and practical aspects of the programme will be effectively integrated.

**Reason:** Discussion with the students from the DipHE Operating department practice programme at the visit indicated it was possible that a student could be placed in a practice setting without having had any theoretical teaching about that setting beforehand. For this programme also, as independent learners, the programme team expects that students will take responsibility to ensure they have the required knowledge base prior to undertaking any placement, including those of which they have received no theoretical teaching from the education provider. To facilitate this, a full set of programme documentation will be available to students electronically. However, the visitors noted that the students felt that it was beneficial to receive theoretical teaching prior to placement rather than conducting their own research.

As it will be expected of some students to undertake their own research into some areas of practice the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to be satisfied that theory and practice were effectively integrated in the curriculum. If some students have different preparation for the application of theoretical knowledge in a practical environment this could lead to perceived differences in the quality of their placement experience. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the programme team are aware of the issues arising from students being assigned to practice settings even if theoretical aspects of that setting have not been taught. This evidence should also include how the programme team will address these issues in future if they arise. The conditions against SETs 3.3 and 5.11 should be looked at alongside this condition as they are linked together. In this way the visitors can be sure that the theoretical and practical aspects of the programme will be effectively integrated and that this standard is met.

#### **5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.**

**Condition:** The programme team must consider ways to ensure the practice educators will be fully prepared to work with students from this programme.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated the programme team currently monitors and evaluates practice placements. This ensures that practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience, and are appropriately trained, prior to working with students on the DipHE Operating Department Practice programme. However, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine how the programme team would ensure that practice placement educators will be prepared to supervise students on this programme. As this programme requires students to reach a level of attainment to make them eligible for a bachelor of honours degree the criteria for achievement will be different from those on the DipHE Operating Department Practice programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to determine how, before commencement

of the programme in 2012, practice placement educators will be appropriately prepared to supervise students and help them achieve the level of attainment required for this programme. In this way the visitors can be sure that the practice placement educators will have the different knowledge, skills and experience required to supervise students on this programme.

**5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence that demonstrates the arrangements the programme team has to ensure students will be fully prepared for each of their individual placement settings.

**Reason:** Discussion with the students from the DipHE Operating department practice programme at the visit indicated that it was possible for a student to be placed in a practice setting without having had any theoretical teaching about that setting beforehand. For this programme also, as independent learners, the programme team will expect students to take responsibility for ensuring that they have the required knowledge base prior to undertaking any placement, including utilising the expertise of the placement educators as necessary. However, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine how the programme team will ensure that preparation for placement is consistent across the cohorts and what consideration is given to the effects any inconsistencies in preparation may have on students' practice placement experience. In preparing students for placement the education provider should provide the required knowledge base in an appropriate way for students. There must be adequate time for the student to prepare and allow for discussion if needed. The programme team should ensure the student can understand all information. The visitors also noted that the management of placement setting allocation is undertaken by the practice placement educators. However they were unsure how practice placement educators were informed about the resources provided for them by the education provider to aid them in undertaking their role.

The visitors therefore require evidence of how the programme team will ensure that students and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement. This evidence should demonstrate how the team ensure that students have the required theoretical knowledge in order to achieve what they need to while on placement. It should also demonstrate what information practice placement educators will be provided with in order to manage placement setting allocations. The conditions against SETs 3.3 and 5.11 should be looked at alongside this condition as they are linked together. In this way the visitors can be sure that practice placement educators will be fully prepared to supervise students and that students on the programme will be able to achieve the required learning outcomes associated with the practical aspects of the programme.



**6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The programme team must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the register unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy specific to the programme. The visitors were satisfied with the recruitment policy and procedures as discussed at the visit and noted that as a new programme the external examiner(s) have not been recruited yet. However, the visitors require evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

## Recommendations

### **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.**

**Recommendation:** The programme team may wish to consider using the existing advertising materials for the DipHE Operating Department Practice website when they look to designing the advertising materials for this programme.

**Reason:** The visitors have had evidence regarding the admissions procedures for this programme and are satisfied this standard is met. The advertising materials for this programme have not yet been created due to the programme commencement date of September 2012. The visitors have seen the advertising materials on the website for the DipHE Operating Department Practice programme and suggest the programme team use it to inform their design of the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice advertising website materials. The visitors have seen that the DipHE Operating Department practice website includes information about the programme leading to eligibility to apply for HPC registration, the need for occupational health and criminal records bureau checks and pertinent information about the profession and the course. The visitors feel this is all important information for both programmes and that by using the existing website to help create the new one it will reduce the workload for the preparations for the new programme.

### **3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.**

**Recommendation:** The programme team may wish to consider their own developmental needs in light of the commencement of this programme.

**Reason:** The visitors have noted there are systems in place to ensure continuing professional and research development for staff at the education provider. The visitors saw how the systems could be used and were satisfied this standard was met. The visitors note this is a new programme designed to enable students to achieve learning outcomes leading to the award of a bachelors degree with honours. As the learning outcomes leading to this award will be a different academic level to the higher level than the DipHE Operating Department Practice programme, the visitors recommend that the programme team utilise the staff development processes in place to ensure they are properly prepared to teach students on both levels. In this way the programme team can utilise their staff development plans to gain appropriate support from the education provider to prepare for the new, and differing, demands of running this programme.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should monitor how the implementation of the Placement Management Partnership (PMP) will impact on how the programme's placements are approved and monitored.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation and in discussions at the visit the programme team will maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements as they did with the DipHE Operating Department Practice programme. They were therefore satisfied this standard is met. However in discussions with the senior team, practice placement providers and the programme team it was clear that the PMP system would shortly be implemented and utilised. The visitors therefore recommend that any future change to how practice placements are approved and monitored as a result of the PMP system should be communicated to the HPC through the major change process. In this way any changes can be monitored to ensure that the programme continues to meet all of the standards of education and training.

Nick Clark  
Paul Blakeman

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	London South Bank University
<b>Programme name</b>	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Date of visit</b>	15 – 17 June 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	10

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 August 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 16 September 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 October 2011.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography, Pg Dip Therapeutic Radiography, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, DipHE Operating Department Practice and the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice.

The professional bodies and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the professional bodies outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) Jacqueline Landman (Lay visitor)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	49
First approved intake	10 September 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2011
Chair	Holly Nicholas (London South Bank University)
Secretary	Catherine Moss (London South Bank University)
Members of the joint panel	Lisa Greatrex (Internal Panel Member) Remy Reyes (College of Occupational Therapists) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational Therapists) Patricia McClure (College of

	Occupational Therapists) Clare Taylor (College of Occupational Therapists)
--	---

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.



## Conditions

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how practice placement settings are monitored to ensure that any resources available to support student learning are effectively used.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements. As the current audit and monitoring processes in place are informal this could lead to perceived inconsistencies in the quality of students' placement experience. In turn this could lead to students successfully appealing assessments associated with their practice placements and graduating from the programme with concerns around their fitness to practice. The visitors therefore require evidence of the formal mechanisms in place that demonstrate that the education provider audits and monitors the resources in practice placement settings to ensure they are appropriate and effectively used. The visitors also require clarification of the criteria used to decide if a practice placement has appropriate resources to support student learning as well as evidence of the supporting protocols that outline the process for dealing with a practice placement that does not meet these criteria.

### **3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the resources in practice placement settings are monitored to ensure that the resources support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements. As the current audit and monitoring processes in place are informal this could lead to perceived inconsistencies in the quality of students' placement experience. In turn this could lead to students successfully appealing assessments associated with their practice placements and graduating from the programme with concerns around their fitness to practice. The visitors therefore require evidence of the formal mechanisms in place that demonstrate that the education provider audits and monitors the resources in practice placement settings to ensure that they support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. The visitors also require clarification of the criteria used to decide if a practice placement has appropriate resources to ensure that they

support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme as well as evidence of the supporting protocols that outline the process for dealing with a practice placement that does not meet these criteria.

### **3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the resources in practice placement settings are monitored to ensure that they are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements. As the current audit and monitoring processes in place are informal this could lead to perceived inconsistencies in the quality of students' placement experience. In turn this could lead to students successfully appealing assessments associated with their practice placements and graduating from the programme with concerns around their fitness to practice. The visitors therefore require evidence of the formal mechanisms in place that demonstrate that the education provider audits and monitors the resources, including IT facilities, in practice placement settings to ensure that they are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students. The visitors also require clarification of the criteria used to decide if a practice placement has appropriate and available resources as well as evidence of the supporting protocols that outline the process for dealing with a practice placement that does not meet these criteria.

### **5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and outline the process for checking the quality of placements. The education provider must also produce guidelines on their placement requirements, articulating what they consider constitutes a safe and supportive placement environment.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements. As the current audit and monitoring processes in place are informal this could lead to perceived inconsistencies in the quality of students' placement experience. In turn this could lead to students successfully appealing assessments associated with their practice placements and graduating from the programme with concerns around their fitness to practice. The visitors therefore require further information to demonstrate that the education provider is responsible for placements and the management of placements in the

programme. The visitors require further evidence of the auditing process and the guidelines in place to ensure that the education provider can make a judgement on whether placements are of good quality and provide safe and supportive environments.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and outline a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements. The visitors therefore did not have enough evidence that the education provider has a thorough and effective system in place for the approval and monitoring of placements and that the education provider was responsible for the placements in the programme. The visitors require the education provider to provide evidence to demonstrate that there are clear policies and procedures in place around the approval and monitoring of practice placements to ensure that this standard is met.

#### **5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and monitored within practice placements.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements.. However, the visitors could find no evidence of a mechanism in place to ensure that practice placements have equality and diversity policies in place and that they are implemented and monitored. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence outlining how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and monitored within practice placements.

#### **5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence outlining how they ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff is in place at the practice placement setting.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements.. However, the visitors require evidence of the formal mechanisms in place that demonstrate that the education provider audits and monitors the staff within the practice placement setting to ensure that they are adequate in number and appropriately qualified and experienced. The visitors also require clarification of the criteria used to decide if a practice placement has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff, as well as evidence of the supporting protocols that outline the process for dealing with a practice placement that does not meet these criteria.

## Recommendations

### **3.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the mechanisms in place for monitoring attendance for sessions where members of the programme team are not present.

**Reason:** from the documentation provided and from discussions at the visit the visitors were satisfied that the education provider has identified where attendance is mandatory and has associated monitoring mechanisms in place. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted, in discussion with students, that student attendance within the problem based learning (PBL) sessions could be varied. The students also noted that the variable attendance at the PBL sessions was not always conducive to effective team work and resulted in some students feeling disillusioned by the process. The visitors recommend that the education provider considers reviewing the mechanisms in place for monitoring the attendance of these sessions. In this way the programme team may enhance the student experience of the PBL elements of the programme.

Claire Brewis  
Margaret Curr  
Jacqueline Landman

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	London South Bank University
<b>Programme name</b>	Pg Dip Occupational Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Date of visit</b>	15 – 17 June 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	10

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 August 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 16 September 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 October 2011.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography, Pg Dip Therapeutic Radiography, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, DipHE Operating Department Practice and the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice.

The professional bodies and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the professional bodies outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist) Jacqueline Landman (Lay visitor)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	49
First approved intake	10 September 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2011
Chair	Holly Nicholas (London South Bank University)
Secretary	Catherine Moss (London South Bank University)
Members of the joint panel	Lisa Greatrex (Internal Panel Member) Remy Reyes (College of Occupational Therapists) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational Therapists) Patricia McClure (College of



	Occupational Therapists) Clare Taylor (College of Occupational Therapists)
--	---

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how practice placement settings are monitored to ensure that any resources available to support student learning are effectively used.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements. As the current audit and monitoring processes in place are informal this could lead to perceived inconsistencies in the quality of students' placement experience. In turn this could lead to students successfully appealing assessments associated with their practice placements and graduating from the programme with concerns around their fitness to practice. The visitors therefore require evidence of the formal mechanisms in place that demonstrate that the education provider audits and monitors the resources in practice placement settings to ensure they are appropriate and effectively used. The visitors also require clarification of the criteria used to decide if a practice placement has appropriate resources to support student learning as well as evidence of the supporting protocols that outline the process for dealing with a practice placement that does not meet these criteria.

### **3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the resources in practice placement settings are monitored to ensure that the resources support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements. As the current audit and monitoring processes in place are informal this could lead to perceived inconsistencies in the quality of students' placement experience. In turn this could lead to students successfully appealing assessments associated with their practice placements and graduating from the programme with concerns around their fitness to practice. The visitors therefore require evidence of the formal mechanisms in place that demonstrate that the education provider audits and monitors the resources in practice placement settings to ensure that they support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. The visitors also require clarification of the criteria used to decide if a practice placement has appropriate resources to ensure that they

support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme as well as evidence of the supporting protocols that outline the process for dealing with a practice placement that does not meet these criteria.

### **3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the resources in practice placement settings are monitored to ensure that they are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements. As the current audit and monitoring processes in place are informal this could lead to perceived inconsistencies in the quality of students' placement experience. In turn this could lead to students successfully appealing assessments associated with their practice placements and graduating from the programme with concerns around their fitness to practice. The visitors therefore require evidence of the formal mechanisms in place that demonstrate that the education provider audits and monitors the resources, including IT facilities, in practice placement settings to ensure that they are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students. The visitors also require clarification of the criteria used to decide if a practice placement has appropriate and available resources as well as evidence of the supporting protocols that outline the process for dealing with a practice placement that does not meet these criteria.

### **5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and outline the process for checking the quality of placements. The education provider must also produce guidelines on their placement requirements, articulating what they consider constitutes a safe and supportive placement environment.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements. As the current audit and monitoring processes in place are informal this could lead to perceived inconsistencies in the quality of students' placement experience. In turn this could lead to students successfully appealing assessments associated with their practice placements and graduating from the programme with concerns around their fitness to practice. The visitors therefore require further information to demonstrate that the education provider is responsible for placements and the management of placements in the

programme. The visitors require further evidence of the auditing process and the guidelines in place to ensure that the education provider can make a judgement on whether placements are of good quality and provide safe and supportive environments.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and outline a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements. The visitors therefore did not have enough evidence that the education provider has a thorough and effective system in place for the approval and monitoring of placements and that the education provider was responsible for the placements in the programme. The visitors require the education provider to provide evidence to demonstrate that there are clear policies and procedures in place around the approval and monitoring of practice placements to ensure that this standard is met.

#### **5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and monitored within practice placements.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements.. However, the visitors could find no evidence of a mechanism in place to ensure that practice placements have equality and diversity policies in place and that they are implemented and monitored. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence outlining how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and monitored within practice placements.

#### **5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence outlining how they ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff is in place at the practice placement setting.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors found no evidence of a formal practice placement auditing tool and supporting protocols. The visitors noted, in discussions with the programme team, that there was a Placement Management Partnership (PMP) in development which would aid in the formal auditing and monitoring of placements. The visitors were also made aware of a number of informal mechanisms that were in place to audit and monitor practice placements.. However, the visitors require evidence of the formal mechanisms in place that demonstrate that the education provider audits and monitors the staff within the practice placement setting to ensure that they are adequate in number and appropriately qualified and experienced. The visitors also require clarification of the criteria used to decide if a practice placement has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff, as well as evidence of the supporting protocols that outline the process for dealing with a practice placement that does not meet these criteria.

## Recommendations

### **3.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the mechanisms in place for monitoring attendance for sessions where members of the programme team are not present.

**Reason:** from the documentation provided and from discussions at the visit the visitors were satisfied that the education provider has identified where attendance is mandatory and has associated monitoring mechanisms in place. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted, in discussion with students, that student attendance within the problem based learning (PBL) sessions could be varied. The students also noted that the variable attendance at the PBL sessions was not always conducive to effective team work and resulted in some students feeling disillusioned by the process. The visitors recommend that the education provider considers reviewing the mechanisms in place for monitoring the attendance of these sessions. In this way the programme team may enhance the student experience of the PBL elements of the programme.

Claire Brewis  
Margaret Curr  
Jacqueline Landman

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	London South Bank University
<b>Programme name</b>	DipHE Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Date of visit</b>	15 – 17 June 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	9



## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Operating department practitioner' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 August 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 16 September 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 October 2011.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - the level of qualification for entry to the Register, programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Pg Dip Occupational Therapy, BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography and Pg Dip Therapeutic Radiography.

The professional bodies and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the professional bodies, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Nick Clark (Operating department practitioner) Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	20
First approved intake	September 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Holly Nicholas (London South Bank University)
Secretary	Catherine Moss (London South Bank University)
Members of the joint panel	Lisa Greatrex (Internal Panel Member) Helen Booth (College of Operating Department Practice)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Additional information about programmes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit, however, they were reviewed at the visit itself.

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they monitor and evaluate the management of placement setting allocations.

**Reason:** In discussion with students at the visit the visitors noted that it was possible for a student to be placed in a practice setting without having had any theoretical teaching about that setting beforehand. The model of practice placement setting allocation used by the programme team means that it is the responsibility of the practice educator to manage the allocation of placement settings. The visitors also noted that the practice placement educator was not always aware of what theoretical teaching a student had undertaken before undertaking placement. From these discussions the visitors were assured that this was an intermittent issue that did not occur with one particular required setting or with one particular placement provider. However, it is the programme teams' responsibility to support students through the programme and for the programme team to monitor and subsequently act appropriately on any student feedback. The visitors considered this to be particularly important in light of the potential for differing students' experiences of placement setting management and the need to maintain parity of placement experience across the cohorts. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team will monitor the management of placement setting allocation. In this way the visitors can be sure that there are no repeated instances of theoretical learning following placements occurring and that there is a parity of student placement experience across all cohorts.

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence of how the programme specific information, provided in the placement handbook, is effectively used.

**Reason:** In the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors noted the practice placement handbook (Document H, Appendix 4). The handbook was generic to all of the programmes within the Interprofessional Scheme in Allied Health Professions (IPSAH). From their reading of the handbook the visitors were satisfied that the generic programme material was complete. However, the section designed to contain the specific material for this programme was incomplete (Section 3, p37). The visitors therefore could not determine where information, specific to this programme, would be provided to students. The conditions against SETs 3.3, 4.3 and 5.11 can be looked at alongside this standard as they will help the programme team consider the relevant information the visitors wish to see. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide further evidence as to how the programme specific information in the placement handbook is effectively used.

### **4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence that clearly demonstrates the requirements of the programme team, the practice educators and the students in terms of ensuring the theoretical and practical aspects of the programme are effectively integrated.

**Reason:** Discussion with the students at the visit indicated it was possible that a student could be placed in a practice setting without having had any theoretical teaching about that setting beforehand. As independent learners, the programme team expects that students take responsibility to ensure they have the required knowledge base prior to undertaking any placement, including those of which they have received no theoretical teaching from the education provider. To facilitate this, a full set of programme documentation is available to students electronically. However, the visitors noted that the students felt that it was beneficial to receive theoretical teaching prior to placement rather than conducting their own research.

As it was expected of some students to undertake their own research into some areas of practice the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to be satisfied that theory and practice were effectively integrated into the curriculum. If some students had different preparation for the application of theoretical knowledge in a practical environment this could lead to perceived differences in the quality of their placement experience. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the programme team are aware of the issues arising from students being assigned to practice settings even if theoretical aspects of that setting have not been taught. This evidence should also include how the programme team will address these issues in future if they arise. The conditions against SETs 3.3 and 5.11 should be looked at alongside this condition as they are linked together. In this way the visitors can be sure that the theoretical and practical aspects of the programme are effectively integrated and that this standard is met.

### **5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence that demonstrates the arrangements the programme team has to ensure students are fully prepared for each of their individual placement settings.

**Reason:** Discussion with the students at the visit indicated that it was possible for a student to be placed in a practice setting without having had any theoretical teaching about that setting beforehand. As independent learners, the programme team expected students to take responsibility for ensuring that they have the

required knowledge base prior to undertaking any placement, including utilising the expertise of the placement educators as necessary. However, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine how the programme team ensures that preparation for placement is consistent across the cohorts and what consideration is given to the effect any inconsistencies in preparation may have on students' practice placement experience. In preparing students for placement the education provider should provide the required knowledge base in an appropriate way for students. There must be adequate time for the student to prepare and allow for discussion if needed. The programme team should ensure the student can understand all information. The visitors also noted that the management of placement setting allocation is undertaken by the practice placement educators. However they were unsure how practice placement educators were informed about the resources provided for them by the education provider to aid them in undertaking their role.

The visitors therefore require evidence of how the programme team ensure that students and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement. This evidence should demonstrate how the team ensure that students have the required theoretical knowledge in order to achieve what they need to while on placement. It should also demonstrate what information practice placement educators will be provided with in order to manage placement setting allocations. The conditions against SETs 3.3 and 5.11 should be looked at alongside this condition as they are linked together. In this way the visitors can be sure that practice placement educators are fully prepared to supervise students and that students on the programme can achieve the required learning outcomes associated with the practical aspects of the programme.

**6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The programme team must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the register unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the external examiner recruitment policy specific to the programme. The visitors were satisfied with the recruitment policy and procedures as discussed at the visit. However, the visitors require evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should monitor how the implementation of the Placement Management Partnership (PMP) will impact on how the programme's placements are approved and monitored.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation and in discussions at the visit the programme team will maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements. They were therefore satisfied this standard is met. However in discussions with the senior team, practice placement providers and the programme team it was clear that the PMP system would shortly be implemented and utilised. The visitors therefore recommend that any future change to how practice placements are approved and monitored as a result of the PMP system should be communicated to the HPC through the major change process. In this way any changes can be monitored to ensure that the programme continues to meet all of the standards of education and training.

Nick Clark  
Paul Blakeman



## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Manchester
<b>Programme name</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	17 – 18 May 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	10

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Clinical psychologist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 12 July 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 30 September 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 6 December 2011.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner psychology profession came onto the register in July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	24
First approved intake	1 January 1992
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2011
Chair	Philip Keeley (University of Manchester)
Secretary	Ryan Hurst (University of Manchester)
Members of the joint panel	Gillian Hardy (British Psychological Society) Chris McCusker (British Psychological Society) Renee Rickard (British Psychological Society) Ally Chenery (British Psychological Society) Molly Ross (British Psychological Society)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure that the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning policy is clearly articulated to applicants to the programme.

**Reason:** During discussions with the programme team it was clear that no accreditation of prior (experiential) learning would be offered to applicants to, or students on, the programme. However the visitors could not identify where in the programme documentation or advertising materials that the programme team clearly states this. This is to ensure that applicants have the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme. Therefore the programme team must revisit the programme documentation and advertising materials to clearly articulate that the programme does not give credit for applicants' or students' prior (experiential) learning.

### **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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure that applicants to the programme are made aware that formal consent to participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching will be required as a condition of entry to the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors note that the education provider asks successful applicants to sign a formal consent form before they participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching. The visitor's note that successful applicants are asked to sign this consent form before they take up an offer of a place on the programme and is therefore a condition of employment.

The visitors note that in the 'Letter to entrants' within appendix 2.4, the education provider clearly states that 'the offer is subject to three conditions', of which one is 'HPC consent to participate'. The visitors could not find any reference within the documentation outlining this as an entry requirement. The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure that applicants to the programme are made aware that formal consent to participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching will be required as a condition of entry to the programme. The visitors also require the education provider to clearly specify that any consent protocols in place are those designed and implemented by the education provider and not the HPC.

### **5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and outline the process for approving and monitoring practice placements to ensure they are safe and supportive.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors could not find evidence of formal mechanisms in place to check the quality of practice placements before they are used. The visitors noted that the 'guidance for trainee health and safety induction' and the 'health and safety on placement' documents address some of the health and safety issues related to practice placements. However, the visitors were concerned that these documents were retrospective in nature and that no formal mechanism was in place to ensure that practice placement settings are safe and supportive before students go on placement. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the auditing process and the guidelines in place to ensure that the education provider can make a judgement on whether practice placements provide safe and supportive environments. The education provider must also produce guidelines that articulate what they constitute as a safe and supportive practice placement environment.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of a thorough and effective system in place for approving and monitoring practice placements.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors could not find evidence of formal mechanisms in place to check the quality of practice placements before they are used. The visitors noted the 'guidance for trainee health and safety induction' and the 'health and safety on placement' documents, as well as discussions with the programme team outlining the informal mechanisms and minimum standards in place for approving practice placements. However, the visitors were concerned that these documents were retrospective in nature and that no formal mechanism was in place to ensure that practice placement are approved before they are used. From discussions with the programme team the visitors note that the programme currently utilises well established practice placements from within the NHS, however note that it is likely that in the future they will need to utilise new placements from within the NHS as well as placements outside of the NHS. The visitors therefore require clear written protocols that outline the systems in place to ensure that practice placements are approved and monitored in a thorough and effective way, including clear criteria that outline the minimum threshold standards for placement approval.

#### **5.13 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the learning and teaching methods in place to ensure that students gain appropriate consent from service users before writing up case reviews

**Reason:** The visitors noted discussions with the students in which the students stated that they always gained informed consent from service users before writing up case reviews. However, the visitors were concerned that in a number of instances the only evidence of this informed consent was from case notes taken during the practice placement. The visitors also noted in discussions with the programme team that different Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) have different policies in place for gaining informed consent from service users. The programme team finally discussed the fact that written consent should be obtained from service users where possible and represents good practice. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the learning and teaching methods that are in place to ensure that students are well informed about good practice for gaining informed consent from service users.

**6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the assessment strategy and design to ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the following standard of proficiency:

- **1a.3 - understand the importance of and be able to maintain confidentiality**
- **1a.4 - understand the importance of and be able to obtain informed consent**

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that students are able to pass an assessment despite breaching confidentiality within the assessment. The visitors were concerned that the current assessment criteria relating to confidentiality and informed consent may not ensure students understand the importance of confidentiality and the importance of obtaining informed consent and therefore demonstrate that they meet standard of proficiency 1a.3 and 1a.4. The visitors noted that the current system allows students who breach confidentiality to pass with anonymity corrections with work been given back to students to make corrections. The visitors require the education provider to demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensures that students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency 1a.3 and 1a.4.

**6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme



documentation regarding aegrotat awards and that this is clearly accessible to students.

**6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that one external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. The visitors were happy that the current external examiner meets the requirement of the HPC. However this standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme must state that at least one external examiner appointed to the programme needs to be appropriately registered or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. Therefore the visitors require evidence that HPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the documentation, specifically in the programme regulations, to ensure that this standard is met.

## Recommendations

### **2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to enhance the information about what reasonable adjustments can be made and what support services are available to individuals with certain health requirements.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors are satisfied that this standard has been met. The visitors noted that in the discussions with the programme team that they gave a number of examples where reasonable adjustments had been made to support students on the programme. The visitors did, however, note an apparent discrepancy between the discussions with the programme team and students and the information made available within the programme documentation. The visitors felt that information on reasonable adjustments and support mechanisms that the programme team were operating could be made more explicit in the programme documentation to ensure that the options and services available to individuals with health requirements are more clearly and consistently highlighted.

### **2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider taking a more strategic approach in the monitoring and implementation of its equality and diversity policies.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors are satisfied that this standard has been met. The visitors noted that the programme team monitors the admissions data that it receives from the Clearing House. The visitors also noted that the education provider gave an example of engagement work with local schools through which they were attempting to raise the profile of clinical psychology to currently under-represented groups. The visitors recommend that the programme team should consider taking a more strategic approach to the way it monitors and implements its equality and diversity policies. The visitors would like the education provider to consider formulating an equality and diversity strategy at a programme level to ensure that the work currently being undertaken around equality and diversity is conducted in a consistent, transparent and measured way.

### **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the protocols in place for gaining students informed consent to participate as service

users in practical and clinical teaching and consider moving the point at which the programme team gains consent.

**Reason:** The visitors note that the education provider asks successful applicants to sign a formal consent form before they participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors are therefore satisfied that a system is in place for gaining students' informed consent and this standard is met. However, the visitor's note those successful applicants are asked to sign this consent form before they take up an offer of a place on the programme and is therefore a condition of employment.

The visitors highlighted that gaining consent from successful applicants before the programme begins may not allow them to have sufficient information about the nature of the practical and clinical teaching that they are expected to be involved in, and therefore they may not be able to make a fully informed choice about whether to consent. The visitors also highlighted that applicants may feel as though they had to give their consent despite not being fully informed as they had not yet secured a place on the programme.

From discussions with students the visitors noted that they had all signed the consent form, but also in addition, that the programme team had made students aware that they could opt out of some sessions if they caused particular emotional distress and that they could discuss any concerns with a member of the programme team before the session. The visitors finally noted the 'Guidance for managing emotional distress within teaching' document within appendix 3.14.

The visitors strongly recommend that the programme team consider gaining students consent for participation in practical and clinical teaching after they have been accepted and have taken up a place on the programme. The visitors suggest that the education provider may want to consider utilising the 'Guidance for managing emotional distress within teaching' document as well as the 'Consent for teaching' form as part of a formal session during the programme induction to ensure that all students are well informed about their options and are able to discuss any concerns with a member of the programme team.

### **5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider adding an equality and diversity check into the audit and placement induction documentation.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors are satisfied that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students and that this standard has been met. However, the visitors noted in discussions with the programme team that the main assurance that this was the case was that all placements were subject to the equality and diversity policies of the Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) where the specific practice placements were based. The programme team also stated that equality and diversity policies were covered during the placement inductions. However the visitors recommend adding a formal equality and

diversity check into the audit and placement induction documentation. This is to ensure that the policies in place are being implemented.

**5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the education provider continues to think creatively about how they involve practice placement educators and heads of service in the formal collaborative structures within the programme.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team and a review of the programme documentation the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met. However the visitors also noted that difficulties had arisen which had led to some practice placement educators and heads of service not being involved in formal collaborative structures such as the annual programme review and the placement forum. The visitors suggest that the education provider continues to think creatively about how they involve practice placement educators and heads of service in the formal collaborative structures within the programme to ensure that practice placement providers continue to value the positives of collaborative work and have on going 'buy-in' to the programme.

Sabiha Azmi  
Ruth Baker

Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Nottingham
<b>Programme name</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Clinical psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	12 – 13 May 2011

Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	5
Recommended outcome .....	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	16

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Clinical psychologist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 6 July 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 16 September 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 6 December 2011.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner psychology profession came onto the register in July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The programme is delivered and validated in collaboration between two education providers. This visit assessed the programme delivered at the University of Nottingham and at the University of Lincoln. A separate report exists for the programme delivered and validated at University of Lincoln.

The professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report produced by the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Laura Golding (Clinical psychologist) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	19 per cohort shared between the two education provider delivery sites
First approved intake	September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Todd Hogue (University of Lincoln)
Secretary	Alison Wilson (University of Lincoln)
Members of the joint panel	Helen Combes (British Psychological Society) Alison Gold (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society) Robert Knight (British Psychological Society) Adrian Neal (British Psychological Society)

	Graham Pratt (British Psychological Society)
--	--



## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supplementary documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC reviewed the External Examiners' reports for 2009-2010 prior to the visit. The HPC did not review the External Examiners' reports for 2008-2009 prior to the visit, however, they were provided at the visit itself.

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 46 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 11 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme.

Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **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.**

**Condition:** The programme team must revisit programme documentation and advertising materials, including the websites, to include information about accreditation of prior learning (APEL or APL) policies for the programme.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussions at the visit confirmed that the programme has no provision for accreditation of prior learning (APEL or APL) policies for entry to the programme. The documentation included the clearing house entry website (document A) as programme advertising materials. The clearing house entry website is used for a number of clinical psychology programmes from different course centres across England and Wales. In the entry requirements on the clearing house entry website there was no information that clearly stated APEL or APL policies were not applicable for this programme.

Each education provider delivering this programme has its own website materials for the programme. The information on the education provider's website page for this programme did not state that APEL or APL policies could not be used for this programme. The tender document provided (document T) was the only document which stated there was no provision for APL or APEL policies for this programme.

The visitors were satisfied that the programme does not use APEL or APL policies but were aware this information should be communicated clearly for all potential applicants for the programme. The information should be placed in as many areas as necessary to ensure potential applicants have access to this information. The visitors therefore require advertising materials (the individual education provider's programme website and the clearing house entry website) and programme documentation (such as the programme handbook) to be revised to include this information to ensure that potential applicants have all the information they need to make an informed choice on whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

### **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.**

**Condition:** The programme team must revisit programme documentation and advertising materials, including the websites, to include information about compliance with health requirements and criminal conviction checks prior to accepting an offer of a place on the programme.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussions at the visit confirmed that compliance with health requirements and criminal conviction checks is necessary prior to being offered a place on the programme. The documentation provided prior to

the visit included the clearing house entry website as programme advertising materials. The clearing house entry website is used for a number of clinical psychology programmes from different course centres across England and Wales. In the entry requirements on the clearing house entry website there was a statement that “all offers of a place on the course are dependent on satisfactory criminal record and health checks.” (Document A, p4).

Each education provider delivering this programme has its own website materials for the programme. The information on the education provider’s website page for this programme did not state that an offer of a place on the programme would be dependent on satisfactory health and criminal record checks.

The visitors were satisfied that the programme has the requirements of the health and criminal conviction checks but were aware this information should be communicated clearly for all potential applicants to the programme. The information should be placed in as many areas as necessary to ensure potential applicants have full access to this information. The visitors therefore require advertising materials (the individual education provider’s programme website) and programme documentation (such as the programme handbook) to be revised to include this information to ensure that potential applicants have all the information they need to make an informed choice on whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

### **3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence they are planning to take actions to improve the problems they are encountering at this education provider site caused by the lack of confidential space available.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit indicated there were concerns about the programme accommodation at this education provider site. The visitors noted that problems had been identified - “Staff accommodation in Nottingham remains more problematic. The lack of space for confidential consultation and telephone calls, which had been the subject of an accreditation condition, has been addressed through ad hoc rental of office space from an organisation adjacent to Jubilee Campus and increased use of temporarily unoccupied offices. In practice, many non-confidential tutorials are conducted in a public space, the foyer of International House, which is less than ideal” (Annual Report 2009-2010, p7).

During the tour of facilities the visitors noted there was a limited number of office space available for the programme team and it was clear there would be difficulties in having confidential space available when required for the programme. The visitors noted that some rooms were not effectively soundproofed and conversations could easily be overheard from outside the rooms. The visitors also noted some of the walls and doors had glass sections which meant that individuals inside the rooms could be easily seen. Discussions indicated registers of unoccupied rooms were held in order to find available rooms for tutorials and personal tutor sessions. Discussions with the programme

team and students highlighted they were very aware of the issue around the lack of confidential space and were aware that during meetings or phone calls with trainees, clinical supervisors or service users it was likely they would be overheard.

The visitors considered the problems regarding the confidential space available, was an issue for personal tutors, trainees and service users. The visitors considered a programme of this nature to require an amount of personal reflection as part of the required learning of the programme and this therefore could mean there was the possibility trainees would experience personal distress. The visitors agreed it is important for trainees to be able to openly discuss any issues with their personal tutor in a safe, supportive and confidential environment. The visitors considered communications with service users involved with the programme to need a confidential environment as this could involve an amount of personal distress from service users.

The visitors suggest a number of actions could be implemented to improve the situation. They suggest the securing of higher quality soundproofing for walls and doors and acquiring screens for glassed sections of rooms could be cost-effectively accomplished. They suggest the programme team review the current usage of all rooms available and consider making rooms at the corners of the building permanently available for staff to use for ad-hoc personal tutor meetings or for sensitive phone calls. The visitors strongly suggest the programme team look to increasing awareness of the severity of this situation for the senior management team by ensuring the issue is reported through quality assurance processes and through as many committee and reporting structures as possible.

The visitors are aware that there are difficulties when looking at areas outside the remit of the programme team, however they require assurances that the programme team are looking to implement some actions to improve the problems they are encountering at this education provider site caused by the lack of confidential space available.

### **3.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence they have plans in place to ensure there are adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in light of the problems they are encountering at this education provider site caused by the lack of confidential space available.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit indicated there were concerns about the programme accommodation at this education provider site. The visitors noted problems had been identified - "Staff accommodation in Nottingham remains more problematic. The lack of space for confidential consultation and telephone calls, which had been the subject of an accreditation condition, has been addressed through ad hoc rental of office space from an organisation adjacent to Jubilee Campus and increased use of temporarily unoccupied offices. In practice, many non-confidential tutorials are conducted in a public space, the foyer of International House, which is less than ideal" (Annual Report 2009-2010, p7).

During the tour of facilities the visitors noted there was a limited number of office space available for the programme team and it was clear when personal tutor sessions were needed there would be difficulties in obtaining available confidential rooms. The visitors noted that some rooms were not effectively soundproofed and conversations could easily be overheard from outside the rooms. The visitors also noted some of the walls and doors had glass sections which meant that individuals inside the rooms could be easily seen. Discussions indicated registers of unoccupied rooms were held in order to find available rooms for tutorials and personal tutor sessions. The visitors noted while registers may work for planned meetings, for any ad-hoc trainee meetings it would be difficult to find available and confidential space. Discussions with the programme team and students highlighted they were very aware of the issue around the lack of confidential space and were aware that during meetings or phone calls it was likely they would be overheard.

The visitors considered these problems regarding the confidential space available, was an issue for personal tutors and trainees. The visitors considered a programme of this nature to require an amount of personal reflection as part of the required learning of the programme and this therefore could mean there was the possibility trainees would experience personal distress. The visitors agreed it is important for trainees to be able to openly discuss any issues with their personal tutor in a safe, supportive and confidential environment. The visitors agreed it was the programme teams' responsibility as part of the requirement to support the welfare and wellbeing of trainees whilst they are on the programme.

The visitors suggest a number of actions could be implemented to improve the situation. They suggest the investment of money in soundproofing walls and doors and acquiring screens for glassed sections of rooms could be cost-effectively accomplished. They suggest the programme team review the current usage of all rooms available and consider making rooms at the corners of the building permanently available for staff to use for ad-hoc personal tutor meetings or sensitive phone calls. The visitors strongly suggest the programme team look to increasing awareness of the severity of this situation for the senior management team by ensuring the issue is reported through quality assurance processes and through as many committee and reporting structures as possible.

The visitors are aware that there are difficulties when looking at areas outside the remit of the programme team, however they require assurances that the programme team are looking to implement some actions to ensure there are adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in light of the problems they are encountering at this education provider site caused by the lack of confidential space available.

### **3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.**

**Condition:** The programme team must revise programme documentation to clearly articulate all aspects of the students' complaints processes for trainees.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit included the two education provider's formal students' complaints procedures for the programme and the programme handbook. Discussions with the trainees highlighted they were aware the two education providers had student complaints procedures but were uncertain if there were any set procedures which allowed them to contact the programme team to discuss any problems on an informal basis prior to initiating their own education provider's students' complaints procedure. The visitors noted the formal student complaints procedures for both education providers included statements surrounding informal resolutions (Document F, p2 and Document G, p3). The visitors also noted the programme handbook included information about the fitness to practise procedures but did not include the students' complaints procedures. The visitors considered information regarding the informal resolution of any issues to be important information alongside the formal students' complaints procedure information. The visitors suggest the programme team include information about the informal resolution procedures for trainees in the programme handbook and supplement this information with links to the two education providers' formal complaints procedures in order that trainees can find the information pertinent to their 'base' education provider. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise programme documentation to ensure all aspects of the students' complaints processes are clearly articulated for trainees.

### **3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to ensure there are appropriate fitness to practise procedures for the programme, in light of the two delivery sites and the need for equitable regulations.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit included information about the fitness to practise procedures in place for the programme. The visitors noted concerns had been raised in the education provider's response to the external examiners reports 2009-2010, "trainees who have been judged as failing to meet standards of professional practice ...[were] allowed to continue on the programme following university appeals processes" (p25). Discussion with the programme team indicated the education providers jointly running and delivering the programme have two separate university fitness to practise and appeals procedures which do not take full account of the nature of the separate education providers' procedures. As a result there was the fitness to practise incident noted by the external examiner where a trainee failed an aspect of the programme, instigated extenuating circumstances procedures and had allowances made for them. The trainee then subsequently failed the same aspect of the programme. They then were able to go through processes which did not take account of the extenuating circumstances and so were allowed to remain on the programme.

This concerned the visitors as it indicated that the fitness to practise procedures may not be fit for purpose for this programme. Discussions with the programme team indicated this was a problem they were aware of. The programme must have an equitable process for trainees given the two sites for the programme. The visitors suggest the development of joint fitness to practise and appeal regulations which override the individual education provider regulations be the most appropriate solution for this problem. The visitors also suggest looking at the condition for SET 6.10 alongside this condition as they are closely linked. The fitness to practise procedures should identify and address concerns and allow for an appropriate range of outcomes. The process used must be appropriate to the clinical nature of the programme and the delivery of the programme academically and through placements. The visitors therefore require evidence to ensure there is an appropriate fitness to practise procedure for the programme, in light of the two delivery sites and the need for equitable regulations.

### **5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of how they ensure all placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit included the placement contract, details that the clinical supervisors have undertaken training and general information regarding clinical supervisors at placements. The visitors considered these to be useful in showing how the trainees are supported at placement. However they judged there to be not enough evidence to show how the education provider ensures the placement settings are safe and supportive environments for trainees. There was no evidence of any risk assessments undertaken or how health and safety policies and procedures are monitored at placement settings. The programme team must maintain overall responsibility for each placement including ensuring the placement setting provides a safe and supportive environment. The visitors were concerned there was no formal method for the programme team to ensure the placement environments are safe and supportive for the trainees. The visitors suggest a method be incorporated into the programmes placement approval and monitoring systems. The visitors suggest conditions for SETs 5.4, 5.6, 5.7 and 5.8 be looked at alongside this condition as they are closely linked. The visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence of how they ensure all placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of how they maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit detailed the placement structures for the programme. There are three NHS trusts which provide



placements for the programme. It was stated that “monitoring and ensuring the quality of practice learning is handled jointly by the Supervisors Subcommittee and by the Senior Clinical Tutors who work closely with supervisors and local service heads / managers to ensure both trainee and service needs are met as far as possible” (Document T, 6.7.6 Monitoring the quality of practice learning).

In discussion at the visit it was indicated the system used for monitoring the placements was via the placement reviews and the Trainee's Evaluation of Placement form. The visitors note that monitoring of this kind would only explore the trainees' placement experience and would not be appropriate to explore each individual placement's qualities and management of the placement. The programme team must maintain overall responsibility for each placement including the management of a formal system to approve and monitor practice placements against criteria set by the programme team.

The visitors are aware that the placements currently used have been involved with the programme for some time. They are also aware that there may be instances when new placements need to be sourced. The visitors were concerned there was no formal system for the education provider to approve and then regularly monitor new placements in order to maintain the safe and supportive environment for the trainees. The approval and monitoring systems can also affect SETs 5.3, 5.6, 5.7 and 5.8 so visitors suggest looking at these conditions together. The visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence of how they maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

#### **5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of how they ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit included the placement contract, a list of clinical supervisors and general information regarding clinical supervisors at placements. The visitors considered these to be useful indicators that the education provider was aware of the need to monitor clinical supervisors. However they judged there to be not enough evidence to show how the programme team ensures there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting. There was no evidence that information regarding other staff at the placement setting who could be involved with the trainees' learning was taken into account.

The programme team must maintain overall responsibility for each placement including ensuring there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement settings. The visitors were concerned there was no formal method for the education provider to ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement settings. The visitors suggest this be incorporated into the programmes placement approval and monitoring systems. The visitors suggest the conditions for SETs 5.3, 5.4, 5.7 and 5.8 be looked at alongside this standard as they are

closely linked. The visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence of how they ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

### **5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of how they ensure the clinical supervisors have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit included the placement contract, a list of clinical supervisors and general information regarding clinical supervisors at placements. The visitors considered these to be useful indicators the education provider was aware of the need to monitor clinical supervisors however judged there to not be enough evidence to show how the programme team ensures the clinical supervisors have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience required to work with trainees. There was no evidence that information regarding clinical supervisors' knowledge, skills and experience was required by the programme team.

The programme team must maintain overall responsibility for each placement including ensuring the clinical supervisors at the placement settings have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to work with the trainees. The visitors were concerned there was no formal method for the programme team to ensure clinical supervisors have the appropriate knowledge, skills and experience to work with trainees. The visitors suggest this be incorporated into the programmes placement approval and monitoring systems. The visitors suggest the conditions for SETs 5.3, 5.4, 5.6 and 5.8 be looked at alongside this standard as they are closely linked. The visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence of how they ensure the clinical supervisors at the placement settings have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to work with the trainees.

### **5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**

**Condition:** The programme team must ensure clinical supervisors undertake appropriate practice educator training prior to working with trainees.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussions at the visit indicated there were arrangements for training sessions held for the clinical supervisors of this programme. In discussion at the visit it was indicated it was expected that a clinical supervisor undertake the training prior to working with trainees however it was not clear that this was a mandatory requirement. The visitors received a list of clinical supervisors as part of the evidence this standard was met however there was no indication the training undertaken by the supervisors was recorded. The programme team must maintain overall responsibility for each placement including ensuring training of some form has taken place prior to undertaking work with the trainee. The visitors were concerned there was no formal method for the programme team to ensure clinical supervisors had undertaken some form of initial training prior to working with the trainees. The visitors suggest this

be incorporated into the programmes placement approval and monitoring systems. The visitors suggest the conditions for SETs 5.3, 5.4, 5.6 and 5.7 be looked at alongside this standard as they are closely linked. The visitors require further evidence that the programme team have ensured the clinical supervisors have undertaken appropriate training prior to working with trainees.

#### **6.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for a procedure for the right of appeal for students.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to ensure the procedures for the right of appeal and extenuating circumstances for the programme are appropriate, in light of the two delivery sites and the need for equitable regulations.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit included information about the right of appeal and extenuating circumstances procedures that were in place for the programme. The visitors noted concerns had been raised in the education provider's response to the external examiners reports 2009-2010, "trainees who have been judged as failing to meet standards of professional practice ... [were] allowed to continue on the programme following university appeals processes" (p25). Discussion with the programme team indicated the education providers jointly running and delivering the programme have two separate university appeals procedures which do not take full account of the nature of the separate education provider processes. As a result there was the instance noted by the external examiner where a trainee failed an aspect of the programme, instigated extenuating circumstances procedures and had allowances made for them. The trainee then subsequently failed the same aspect of the programme. They then were able to go through the appeals processes which did not take account of the extenuating circumstances and so were allowed to remain on the programme.

This concerned the visitors as it indicated the right to appeal and extenuating circumstances procedures may not be fit for purpose for this programme. Discussions with the programme team indicated this was a problem they were aware of. The programme must have an equitable process which takes into account the differing processes given the two education provider sites for the programme. The visitors suggest the development of joint extenuating circumstances and appeal regulations which override the individual education provider regulations be the most appropriate solution for this problem. The visitors suggest looking at the condition for SET 3.16 alongside this condition as they are closely linked. The processes used must be appropriate to the clinical nature of the programme and the delivery of the programme. The visitors require further evidence to ensure the procedures for the right of appeal and extenuating circumstances for the programme are appropriate, in light of the two delivery sites and the need for equitable regulations.

## Recommendations

### **4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.**

**Recommendation:** The programme team may wish to consider incorporating references and links to all HPC publications that are suitable for trainees in the programme documentation where it is appropriate.

**Reason:** From discussion at the visit and programme documentation seen, the visitors were satisfied this standard was met and that the HPC featured strongly as part of the trainees' learning. The visitors noticed from the programme handbook and the module indicative reading lists there were publications available from the HPC which were not referenced but which could be used to supplement learning. The visitors suggest that by including website links to the publications where appropriate, the trainees' knowledge of the HPC will be broadened and they will remain up to date with the current regulatory status. The visitors suggest publications such as Your guide to our standards for continuing professional development, Guidance on conduct and ethics for students and Guidance on health and character could be cited in several places. The visitors additionally felt website links to the Standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the Standards of proficiency for practitioner psychologists could be more strongly referenced through the documents. The visitors feel the incorporation of more links to the HPC publications would further embed the HPC within the programme and strengthen the learning experience.

### **5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**

**Recommendation:** The programme team may wish to consider ways to further strengthen the advertising used for clinical supervisors' secondary 'refresher' training sessions.

**Reason:** From discussion at the visit, the visitors noted there had been some difficulties in keeping clinical supervisors informed of the 'refresher' training sessions available. It was noted there had been some changes to the management of the training sessions recently and as a result there was some confusion as to when and where the sessions were being held. The visitors were satisfied 'refresher' training was held regularly however felt there could be other means of advertising the availability of training sessions. The visitors suggest measures such as creating an online advertising website space, sending regular email updates for available sessions or ensuring training is mentioned by the clinical tutor at the clinical visits. The visitors feel by strengthening the clinical supervisors' awareness of training sessions this would encourage attendance.

Laura Golding  
David Packwood

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Oxford Brookes University
<b>Programme name</b>	MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Date of visit</b>	1 – 2 June 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	9

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 27 July 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 September 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 6 December 2011.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered an MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Dugald MacInnes (Lay Visitor)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2012
Chair	Peter Bradley (Oxford Brookes University)
Secretary	N/A (Meetings were recorded)
Members of the joint panel	Ailsa Clarke (Internal Panel Member) Hilary Currie (Internal Panel Member) Louise Scowen (Internal Panel Member) Phil Harper (Internal Panel Member) Meera Shah (Internal Panel Member) Joy Butcher (External Panel Member) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational Therapists) Chris McKenna (College of Occupational Therapists) Gail Boniface (College of Occupational Therapists)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there are currently no external examiners as the programme is new.

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programmes as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

The visitors did not see the library facilities during the tour at the visit. The visitors received the information they needed regarding the library resources during the meetings of the visit.



## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Condition:** The programme team must resubmit any revised programme documentation to ensure the information included is accurate and supports student learning.

**Reason:** Documentation received prior to the visit was presented in draft form and the visitors noted there were some instances of inaccurate information in them. In Document 1- Student programme handbook, the visitors noted the statement, “graduates meet the criteria for their students to apply eligibility for registration with the HPC on graduation” (p12). On completion of an approved programme a successful student will be eligible to apply for HPC registration. Therefore, for clarity, the visitors require this sentence to be corrected and all statements referring to the eligibility to apply for HPC registration to be checked for accuracy. Also in the Student programme handbook, the visitors noted there was an instance of a confusing statement, “The College of Occupational Therapists (COT)...represents the World Federation of Occupational Therapists (WFOT) for approval and accreditation of all occupational therapy programmes in the UK” (p12). This terminology is inaccurate in that the COT accredits programmes and the HPC are the body who approve programmes. For clarity the visitors require this sentence to be corrected and all statements referring to the bodies accrediting, validating or approving the programme to be checked for accuracy. In Document 2 – Appendix 7, section 16, the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme was referenced instead of the MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) programme. To ensure clarity, the visitors require all documents to be checked and corrected, where necessary, to ensure the correct programme is referred to in the correct final versions.

It was indicated the programme team may need to make other revisions to programme documentation in light of the discussions raised at this joint event. In particular this involved the programme learning outcomes, the module learning outcomes and the assessment methods. The visitors require any documentation that is revised to be resubmitted. This is to ensure there are no instances of inaccurate information in the final documentation and that the visitors have the necessary evidence to be sure that the learning resources developed by the programme team are effectively used.

### **4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The programme team must submit the final versions of the module descriptors for the programme.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors for the programme. However, the module descriptors seen were draft and not finalised versions. Discussions at the visit indicated the programme team will make changes to the programme learning outcomes, the module

learning outcomes and assessments as a result of this joint event. The visitors can not determine whether this standard is met until the programme documentation is finalised. As such the visitors will need to review the finalised documentation to determine that the learning outcomes ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the register. The visitors therefore require the programme team to submit the finalised module descriptors for the programme to ensure that the programme meets this standard.

#### **4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence that demonstrates the learning and teaching approaches used for this programme are appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

**Reason:** Documentation provided indicated the programme team planned to implement “dual level teaching” for the programme; students on the programme would “learn the core skills and specific attributes of occupational therapy alongside the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy students” (Document 1 – Student handbook, p36). Discussion at the visit indicated that although the teaching in lectures would be carried out simultaneously, there would be tutorials attached to the modules in which learning at the two different programme levels would be separate. Discussion at the visit examined the student cohort numbers expected. The programme team were aware the numbers of students on the programme may be low. If numbers of students on this MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) programme were very low it was discussed that tutorial sessions may not be as effective as they would be if there were higher numbers of students. Other means of giving the students the tutorial experience required, such as holding tutorials alongside students from the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme, were presented as an option if this occurred.

The visitors were concerned the programme team had not fully considered the implications of having lower numbers on the MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) programme. The visitors require reassurances that the learning strategies used for the MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) students are appropriate to ensure the profession specific learning needs for their level particularly in the tutorial sessions. The visitors suggest the programme team plan a strategy to use if numbers of students on the programme are low. The strategy should take into account the learning needs for the students completing the programme at this level as opposed to the lower level of the BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programme. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide further evidence that demonstrates the learning and teaching approaches used for this programme are appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

**6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The programme team must submit the final versions of the module descriptors for the programme.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors for the programme. However, the module descriptors seen were draft and not finalised versions. Discussions at the visit indicated the programme team will make changes to the programme learning outcomes, the module learning outcomes and assessments as a result of this joint event. The visitors can not determine whether this standard is met until the programme documentation is finalised. As such the visitors will need to review the finalised documentation to determine that assessments of the learning outcomes ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the register. The visitors therefore require the programme team to submit the finalised module descriptors for the programme to ensure that the programme meets this standard.

**6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:** The programme team must submit the final versions of the module information and the assessment methods for the programme.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit included details about the module assessment methods of the programme in the module descriptors and student handbooks. However, the documents describing this module information were draft and not finalised versions. Discussions at the visit indicated the programme team will make changes to the assessment methods as a result of this joint event. The visitors can not determine whether this standard is met until the programme documentation is finalised. As such the visitors will need to review the assessment methods to ensure they will be appropriate to measure the learning outcomes and ensure those who successfully complete the programme can practise safe and effectively. The visitors therefore require the programme team to submit the finalised documentation that describes the assessment methods for the programme to ensure that the programme meets this standard.

## Recommendations

**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.**

**Recommendation:** The programme team may wish to consider creating a checklist of information they will provide for potential applicants when they come to create the advertising materials for the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors have seen the admissions procedures for this programme and are satisfied this standard is met. The advertising materials for this programme have not yet been created due to the education providers' internal requirements for the approval, accreditation and validation process to be complete. The visitors suggest the programme team create a checklist to ensure specific information is included in the advertising material for this programme. The visitors suggest the checklist include the criminal convictions check, health requirements, the fees to be paid for the programme (and associated details), the English level language requirements (both for entry to the programme and upon entry to the Register), and the fact that the programme will be granting eligibility to apply for HPC registration. The visitors recommend this so the programme team can be sure they are including all relevant and pertinent information for potential applicants.

Joanna Goodwin  
Kathryn Heathcote  
Dugald MacInnes

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Oxford Brookes University
<b>Programme name</b>	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Physiotherapist
<b>Date of visit</b>	1 – 2 June 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	9

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Physiotherapist' or 'Physical therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 27 July 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 September 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 6 December 2011.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered an MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Dugald MacInnes (Lay Visitor)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	20 per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2012
Chair	Peter Bradley (Oxford Brookes University)
Secretary	N/A (Meetings were recorded)
Members of the joint panel	Ailsa Clarke (Internal Panel Member) Hilary Currie (Internal Panel Member) Phil Harper (Internal Panel Member) Louise Scowen (Internal Panel Member) Meera Shah (Internal Panel Member) Joy Butcher (External Panel Member) Nina Paterson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) Marilyn Andrews (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists)



## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there are currently no external examiners as the programme is new.

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy programmes as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

The visitors did not see the library facilities during the tour at the visit. The visitors received the information they needed regarding the library resources during the meetings of the visit.

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Condition:** The programme team must resubmit any revised programme documentation to ensure the information included is accurate and supports students learning.

**Reason:** Documentation received prior to the visit was presented in draft form and the visitors noted there were some instances of inaccurate information in them. In the Student Programme Handbook (Additional Sections Required for Validation, University, HPC & CSP), section 5, the visitors noted there was an inaccurate statement, "This course is subject to validation by the university, the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy and the Health Professions Council" (Marketing information: Web Flyer). This terminology is inaccurate in that while the university validates programmes, the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy accredits programmes and the HPC approve programmes. For clarity the visitors require this sentence to be corrected and all statements referring to the bodies accrediting, validating or approving the programme to be checked for accuracy. In the Student Programme Handbook (Additional Sections Required for Validation, University, HPC & CSP), section 5, there was a statement that referenced the BSc (Hons) Occupational therapy programme instead of the MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) programme, "Admission to the B.Sc. (Hons) Pre-registration masters programme in occupational therapy". For clarity, the visitors require all documents to be checked and corrected where necessary to ensure the correct programme is referred to in the final versions.

It was indicated the programme team may need to make other revisions to programme documentation in light of the discussions raised at this joint event. In particular this involved the programme learning outcomes, the module learning outcomes and the assessment methods. The visitors require any documentation that is revised to be resubmitted. This is to ensure there are no instances of inaccurate information in the final documentation and that the visitors have the necessary evidence to be sure that the learning resources developed by the programme team are effectively used.

### **4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The programme team must submit the final versions of the module descriptors for the programme.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors for the programme. However, the module descriptors seen were draft and not finalised versions. Discussions at the visit indicated the programme team will make changes to the programme learning outcomes, the module learning outcomes and assessments as a result of this joint event. The visitors can not determine whether this standard is met until the programme documentation is finalised. As such the visitors will need to review the finalised

documentation to determine that the learning outcomes ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the register. The visitors therefore require the programme team to submit the finalised module descriptors for the programme to ensure that the programme meets this standard.

#### **4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence that demonstrates the learning and teaching approaches used for this programme are appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

**Reason:** Documentation provided indicated the programme team planned to implement “dual level teaching” for the programme, students on the programme “will work alongside the undergraduate Physiotherapy BSc (Hons) students in all the profession specific modules” (Student programme handbook 2012/2013, p27). Discussion at the visit indicated that although the teaching in lectures would be carried out simultaneously, there would be tutorials attached to the modules in which learning at the two different programme levels would be separate. Discussion at the visit examined the student cohort numbers expected. The programme team were aware the numbers of students on the programme may be low. If numbers of students on this MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration) programme were very low it was discussed that tutorial sessions may not be as effective as they would be if there were higher numbers of students. Other means of giving the students the tutorial experience required, such as holding tutorials alongside students from the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme, were presented as an option if this occurred.

The visitors were concerned the programme team had not fully considered the implications of having lower numbers on the MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration) programme. The visitors require reassurances that the learning strategies used for the MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration) students are appropriate to ensure the profession specific learning needs for their level particularly in the tutorial sessions. The visitors suggest the programme team plan a strategy to use if numbers of students on the programme are low. The strategy should take into account the learning needs for the students completing the programme at this level as opposed to the lower level of the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy programme. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide further evidence that demonstrates the learning and teaching approaches used for this programme are appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

**6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The programme team must submit the final versions of the module descriptors for the programme.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors for the programme. However, the module descriptors seen were draft and not finalised versions. Discussions at the visit indicated the programme team will make changes to the programme learning outcomes, the module learning outcomes and assessments as a result of this joint event. The visitors can not determine whether this standard is met until the programme documentation is finalised. As such the visitors will need to review the finalised documentation to determine that assessments of the learning outcomes ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the register. The visitors therefore require the programme team to submit the finalised module descriptors for the programme to ensure that the programme meets this standard.

**6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:** The programme team must submit the final versions of the module information and the assessment methods for the programme.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit included details about the module assessment methods of the programme in the module descriptors and student handbooks. However, the documents describing this module information were draft and not finalised versions. Discussions at the visit indicated the programme team will make changes to the assessment methods as a result of this joint event. The visitors can not determine whether this standard is met until the programme documentation is finalised. As such the visitors will need to review the assessment methods to ensure they will be appropriate to measure the learning outcomes and ensure those who successfully complete the programme can practise safe and effectively. The visitors therefore require the programme team to submit the finalised documentation that describes the assessment methods for the programme to ensure that the programme meets this standard.

## Recommendations

**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.**

**Recommendation:** The programme team may wish to consider creating a checklist of information they will provide for potential applicants when they come to create the advertising materials for the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors have seen the admissions procedures for this programme and are satisfied this standard is met. The advertising materials for this programme have not yet been created due to the education providers' internal requirements for the approval, accreditation and validation process to be complete. The visitors suggest the programme team create a checklist to ensure specific information is included in the advertising material for this programme. The visitors suggest the checklist include the criminal convictions check, health requirements, the fees to be paid for the programme (and associated details), the English level language requirements (both for entry to the programme and upon entry to the Register), and the fact that the programme will be granting eligibility to apply for HPC registration. The visitors recommend this so the programme team can be sure they are including all relevant and pertinent information for potential applicants.

Joanna Goodwin  
Kathryn Heathcote  
Dugald MacInnes

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Queen Margaret University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Occupational therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Occupational therapist
<b>Date of visit</b>	18 – 19 May 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 12 July 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2011.



## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Laura Graham (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive officer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	40
First approved intake	17 September 1999
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2011
Chair	Claire Seaman (Queen Margaret University)
Secretary	Craig Rutherford (Queen Margaret University)
Members of the joint panel	Judith Lane (Internal Panel Member) Michael Stewart (Internal Panel Member) Magda Pieczka (Internal Panel Member) Amy Shanks (Internal Panel Member) Ruth Heames (College of Occupational Therapists) Julie Taylor (College of Occupational Therapists) Remy Reyes (College of Occupational Therapists) Caroline Grant (College of Occupational Therapists)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made two recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and any advertising materials to ensure the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the programme documentation submitted by the education provider that there were some instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to the 'Occupational Therapists Board' of the HPC (Document A, p.65). The HPC does not have an occupational therapists board and students are only eligible to apply to the HPC Register. The documentation also states that HPC expects "...consistent and punctual ... attendance at University" (Document E, p12) and that HPC conditions mean that the programme cannot "...allocat[e] extra-time in examinations to students in undergraduate Levels 1 and 2 whose first language is not English" (Document A, p68). HPC sets no attendance requirements on students and does not set any requirements regarding the allocation of additional time to students in examinations. Both of these regulations can be determined by the education provider. The visitors considered this use of terminology to be inaccurate and potentially misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout. This is to provide clarity for those on, or applying to, the programme and to ensure this standard is met.

### **4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must articulate how the overarching learning outcomes articulated in the module descriptors ensure all of the standards of proficiency for occupational therapists can be met.

**Reason:** After discussion with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the HPC standards of proficiency (SOPs) were utilised and included in the development of the module learning outcomes. However, the visitors were unclear as to how and where the overarching learning outcomes in the module descriptors ensured all relevant SOPs can be met. The visitors therefore require the programme team to describe the distinguishing features, included within the learning outcomes, which ensure that the relevant SOPs are taught and learned. This will then ensure that successful graduates from the programme can meet all of the SOPs for occupational therapists and be eligible to apply to the HPC Register.

### **6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must identify how the assessment of the overarching learning outcomes, stated in the module descriptors, ensure students who successfully complete the programme have met the relevant SOPs.

**Reason:** As for SET 4.1 the visitors were satisfied that the HPC standards of proficiency (SOPs) were utilised and included in the development of the module learning outcomes and assessments. However the visitors were unclear as to how and where the module assessments ensured all of the relevant SOPs were met. The visitors therefore require the programme team to describe how the distinguishing features of the learning outcomes are assessed to ensure all of the relevant SOPs are met. This will then ensure that successful graduates from the programme can meet all of the SOPs for occupational therapists and that this standard continues to be met.

#### **6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide a clear statement, or reference to the relevant regulation, in the programme documentation to ensure students are aware the education provider does not confer aegrotat awards.

**Reason:** From the discussions at the visit the visitors were satisfied the education provider does not confer aegrotat awards. However, the visitors could not identify a clear statement regarding this in the programme documentation. As this regulation regarding aegrotat awards is not included in the programme documentation, this could potentially lead to a successful academic appeal. Therefore the visitors require the programme team to include a clear statement, or reference to the relevant regulation, in the programme documentation that the education provider does not confer aegrotat awards. This will ensure students on the programme will have all of the information they require and that this standard continues to be met.

## Recommendations

### **5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider working towards maintaining a database of practice placement educators and the training they have undertaken.

**Reason:** The visitors were clear from the programme documentation and discussions at the visit that the programme team offered a wide variety of training for practice placement educators. They were also clear that the learning agreements between the education provider and the practice placement providers ensured all practice placement educators should have undertaken appropriate initial training. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard was met. However, they feel that the programme team should consider putting in place further monitoring mechanisms for practice placement educators. The visitors suggest the utilisation of a database to record practice placement educators and what additional training they have undertaken to be a useful addition to the monitoring mechanisms in place. This could help the programme team better target some of their training provision for practice placement educators and may help to ensure greater parity of placement experience for students.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider clarifying the progression and achievement requirements for students due to the use of large credit bearing modules.

**Reason:** The programme documentation provided to the visitors set out clear requirements for student progression through the programme. Therefore the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met. However, in discussion with the programme team it was clear that due to the programme's use of large credit bearing modules this could lead to students, who failed more than one assessment, being required to re-sit a year. This is due to the education provider's regulations requiring that no student can carry more than 80 uncompleted credits from one year of a programme to the next. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team clearly articulate these regulations, along with the possible consequences, to students. They also recommend that the programme team monitor what effect, if any, this may have on student attrition rates throughout the programme. This may help students to be aware of what they are required to achieve, year on year, and will provide the programme team useful information regarding students' progression through the programme.

Laura Graham  
Bernadette Waters

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Surrey
<b>Programme name</b>	Health Psychology (PhD) and PG Cert in Health Psychology Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Health psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	4 – 5 May 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Health psychologist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 1 September 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 October 2011.



## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner psychologist profession came onto the register on 1 July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Lynn Dunwoody (Health Psychologist) George Delafield (Forensic & Occupational Psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Proposed student numbers	12 (total cohort) 3 to 4 per annual intake
First approved intake	2 January 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	3 October 2011
Chair	Day 1 - Simon Appleton (University of Surrey) Day 2 – Marcus Matthews (University of Surrey)
Secretary	Day 1 – Alison Cummins (University of Surrey) Day 2 – Simon Appleton (University of Surrey)
Members of the joint panel	Anna Baker (British Psychological Society) Liz Simpson (British Psychological Society) Molly Ross (British Psychological Society)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review a programme specification prior to the visit as due to its PhD status a programme specification, particular to this programme, does not exist.

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 29 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 28 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure within the admissions documentation (including website information) that potential applicants to the programme have the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted prior to the visit and a review of the programme specific web pages, the visitors were unable to locate the admissions procedures relating to English language; criminal conviction checks; health requirements or clarify the minimum academic requirements for entry to the programme.

The programme team confirmed that for English language there was a minimum requirement across the university and this was outlined on the international student pages of the website. The visitors were therefore satisfied that the admissions procedures applied selection and entry criteria of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English but felt that this must be made more easily accessible on the website.

From discussions with the programme team and students the visitors established that the majority of students had undertaken the MSc Health Psychology programme offered by the education provider. As part of this they received presentations about the HPC approved programme, which included information about the entry requirements and admissions procedures. Applicants, including international applicants, who have completed other programmes accredited by the BPS for Graduate Basis for Chartered Membership may also apply to the programme. However, they do not receive the information provided to students through the presentations and the visitors could not find information relating to criminal conviction checks (or any related costs) or health requirements on the website.

The Handbook for the PhD Programme 2010-2011 (PhD handbook) states that 'the normal minimum academic requirement for registration for a PhD is a 2:1 or equivalent at undergraduate level and a Masters degree in a relevant subject from a recognised institution with a minimum of 65%'. The visitors felt that this could be misleading as it was confirmed by the programme team that it was mandatory for an applicant to have completed a programme accredited by the BPS for Graduate Basis for Chartered Membership.

In summary, the visitors felt that the admissions information including the website information must be updated to provide potential applicants to the programme with the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

### **2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.**

**Condition:** The education provider must undertake criminal conviction checks on entry to the programme.

**Reason:** From discussions with students and practice placement providers, the visitors noted that criminal conviction checks were not undertaken on application to the programme. From the programme team meeting the visitors learnt that criminal convictions checks were only undertaken once a student was on the programme and if the student's placement site or research topic required one prior to commencement. The visitors were concerned that criminal conviction checks were being undertaken once a student was on the programme and not as part of the admissions procedures and therefore were not required for all students on the programme. The visitors felt that as a result a student could undertake the course with a criminal conviction, which due to their choice of research topic or placements, was never brought to the attention of the programme team. The visitors felt that the education provider should, as part of their admissions procedures, consider whether criminal conviction would affect an individual's ability to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) or standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). Without knowing this on application the education provider could not accurately judge this or advise the applicant appropriately about what they could expect when they apply to the HPC register. To ensure this standard continues to be met, the visitors require the education provider to implement criminal conviction checks on entry to the programme.

### **2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.**

**Condition:** The education provider must identify how they ensure that applicants meet the health requirements of the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted the visitors could not locate any information regarding the health requirements for entry to the programme. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there were no standard health requirements in place for entry to the programme as it was dependent on an individual's research topic or placement location. While the visitors appreciated the flexibility, they were unsure how the programme team ensured that they had taken all reasonable steps to keep to any health requirements and made all reasonable adjustments in line with equality and diversity law as part of their admissions procedures. To ensure this standard continues to be met, the visitors require the education provider to identify how applicants can meet the health requirements required to successfully complete the programme.

## **2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.**

**Condition:** The education provider must implement admissions procedures regarding the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) and other inclusion mechanisms on entry to the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation the visitors could not determine where applicants could locate information relating to AP(E)L or other inclusion mechanisms on entry to the programme. From the programme team meeting it was clear that this was because there were no formal mechanisms in place to identify how an applicant's prior learning could be accredited. However, the visitors noted that a student's prior learning was taken into consideration when the supervision plan was agreed at the start of the programme and therefore informal AP(E)L was undertaken once on the programme. This informal use of AP(E)L could lead to some students not completing all aspects of the programme and therefore not meeting all of the relevant standards of proficiency (SOPs). The programme must ensure that all students who successfully complete the programme can meet the SOPs for Health Psychologists to ensure that they can practice safely and effectively once they have successfully applied to the Register. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they assure which SOPs each applicant to the programme had met previously either through APEL or other inclusion mechanisms on entry to the programme in order to show how this standard continues to be met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly outline the programme's management structure including the lines of responsibility and links to the management of practice placement providers, highlighting the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved.

**Reason:** From the review of documentation the visitors noted a number of different roles within the programme structure. These were - PhD Supervisor; Pg Cert Supervisor; Research Supervisor; Supervisor; Main Supervisor; and Senior / Second Supervisor; Work place contact; Work place Supervisor. The visitors learnt that the same person could fulfil more than one role for example; the PhD Supervisor and Pg Cert Supervisor could be the same person. From the programme team meeting the visitors learnt that if this occurred, the meetings with the student would differ and it would be clear whether the meeting was to review the progress of the PhD research or the log book of the Pg Cert. However, the visitors were unclear about the responsibilities of all the named roles and their links to placements and felt that this could lead to confusion amongst students or practice placement providers about who to contact in any appropriate situation.

The representatives at the practice placement providers meeting were very comfortable in their role and the visitors heard about two different placement types. The visitors therefore heard about differences in the roles and responsibilities of the practice placement educators. The roles and responsibilities of the practice placement providers therefore differed and the

visitors were unable to determine whether there was a minimum set of responsibilities for workplace supervisors.

The visitors would therefore require further information which outlines the programme's management structure including the lines of responsibility and links to the management of practice placement providers, highlighting the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that placements are effectively managed.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted the visitors were unsure of how placements were managed. The visitors read in the placement handbook that 'there is no absolute requirement for students to undertake a period of supervised practice on placement in order to successfully complete the Pg Cert [element of the approved programme]'. If a student works within the NHS or a comparable health related post while completing their research (for the PhD element of the approved programme) there may be no requirement for them to complete a period of supervised practice as they are 'likely to find that their current post offers sufficient opportunities to develop and demonstrate their competence in health psychology practice.'

From discussions with the students, practice placement providers and programme team, the visitors identified a number of different types of placement, which were as follows – work (when a student is undertaking their research as part of their job); teaching (gaining teaching experience); consultancy (projects); audit and evaluation (discrete projects) and voluntary placements. It was unclear from the documentation and discussions during the visit which of these types of placement were considered to be integral and a mandatory requirement of the programme. Please see the conditions against SETs 3.15, 5.1 and 5.2 for further details about this.

The visitors also learnt that the programme team did not currently have any processes in place to approve or monitor practice placements. Please see the condition against SET 5.4 for further information.

The education provider has overall responsibility for placement learning and ensuring that suitable systems are in place to support it. The visitors were therefore concerned that the education provider did not consider placements to be a mandatory part of the programme or have the processes in place to effectively manage them. In order for this SET to be met, the visitors require further information on how the programme ensures all placements, where ever they may be, are effectively managed.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must implement regular monitoring and evaluation systems for the Pg Cert element of the approved programme.

**Reason:** From the review of documentation the visitors learnt about, and were satisfied that, the monitoring and evaluation systems for the PhD element of the programme met this standard. However, they could not identify the systems which were in place for the Pg Cert element of the programme. The visitors learnt that the Pg Cert and PhD elements of the programme were run side by side as separate programmes with students completing both simultaneously. Only successful completion of both elements leads to the award of the approved programme. However, as they were run as separate programmes this meant that the Pg Cert element of the programme did not share the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms of the PhD element of the programme. In discussions, the programme team recognised the need to implement regular monitoring and evaluation systems for the Pg Cert element of the programme. Therefore to ensure that this standard continues to be met, the visitors require revised documentation to demonstrate how the regular monitoring and evaluation systems will apply to the Pg Cert element of the programme.

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that the resources available to students on placements are effectively used.

**Reason:** From the review of documentation, tour of facilities and discussions with students and the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that the resources to support student learning within the university were effectively used. However, they were unsure about the resources to support student learning while a student was in placement. Within the documentation the visitors were directed to pages 22 – 26 of the PhD handbook and the placement health and safety checklist which must be completed prior to the start of placements. The visitors were concerned that from their review of the documents and discussions with the programme team, they could not identify the minimum resources which the programme team expected to be accessible to students on placement or how these resources were monitored to ensure they were effectively used. As outlined in the condition against SET 5.4, the visitors learnt that there were no formal processes in place for approving and monitoring placements. The visitors would therefore require further information about how the education provider will ensure that the resources to support student learning are effectively used in all placements to ensure that this SET continues to be met.

### **3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that the resources available to students on placements support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

**Reason:** From the review of documentation, tour of facilities and discussions with students and the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that the resources to support student learning within the university effectively supported the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. However, they were unsure about the resources to support student learning while a student was on



placement. Within the documentation the visitors were directed to pages 22 – 26 of the PhD handbook and the placement health and safety checklist. The visitors were concerned that from their review of the documents and discussions with the programme team they could not identify the minimum resources which the programme team expected to be accessible to students on placement or how these resources were monitored. As outlined in the condition against SET 5.4, the visitors learnt that there were no formal processes in place for approving and monitoring placements. The visitors would therefore like to receive further information about how the education provider ensures that the resources to support student learning in all placements effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

### **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that where students participate as service users, appropriate protocols are used to obtain their consent.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted the visitors learnt that students participated in role play, for example during Course 1 (Teaching and Training) of the PSYD053 module. However they were unable to determine a formal process for obtaining student consent within the documentation. From discussions with the students and the programme team, the visitors learnt that verbal consent was obtained during Course 1 and that participation was not mandatory however no formal process was in place. The visitors were concerned that there was no formal protocol in place to, for example, detail how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained or how situations where students declined from participation were managed. In light of this, the visitors were not satisfied the programme gained informed consent from students or could appropriately manage situations where students declined to participate. The visitors therefore require the education provider to implement formal protocols for obtaining consent from students and for managing situations where they decline from participating when they participate as service users.

### **3.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that where attendance is mandatory that it is clearly identified in the programme documentation and monitored for the academic and placement components of the programme.

**Reason:** From their review of the documentation, the visitors could not identify an attendance policy or where the education provider informed students which elements of the programme required mandatory attendance. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there was an attendance policy of 80% within academia. In the larger classes (those shared with other programmes) this was monitored via a register but due to the small number of students on the programme specific modules a register was not required. The visitors were not able to identify the attendance policy for placements or how this was communicated to students or practice placement educators. The visitors

expected that attendance for those core elements of the programme which closely linked to the SOPs were compulsory, in both the academic and placement components of the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clearly identify within the programme documentation which components of the programme are mandatory and how this is monitored.

### **3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.**

**Condition:** The education provider must formalise the process for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct in all settings.

**Reason:** From the discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt about the process in place for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct within academia. However the visitors were unable to determine the formal process for dealing with concerns which were raised while a student was on placement. This also affects how the programme meets SETs 5.8 and 5.11. The visitors noted from the practice placement educators meeting that they felt very comfortable in being able to pick up the phone to discuss any situation with the programme leader. However, this was done informally on a case by case basis. The visitors were concerned that this could lead to students perceiving they may have been treated differently in similar situations. In turn this perception may lead to decisions being made about professional conduct which could be open to successful academic appeal and, possibly, to students successfully completing the programme with concerns about their professional conduct. To ensure that concerns about students' profession-related conduct are dealt with objectively and consistently in all settings, the visitors require details of a formal process which applies within academia and placements.

### **4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revise the programme documentation to clearly identify how the learning outcomes allow all students to meet the following SOPs;

- **1a.1 be able to practise within the legal and ethical boundaries of their profession**
  - **understand what is required of them by the Health Professions Council**
- **2a.2 be able to select and use appropriate assessment techniques**
  - **be able to use formal assessment procedures (standardised psychometric instruments), systematic interviewing procedures and other structured methods of assessments (eg interviews)**

**Reason:** From the review of documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors could not determine how students were taught and understood what HPC required of them in terms of their legal and ethical boundaries. As outlined in the condition against SET 4.5, the SCPEs were not mentioned within the programme documentation.

From the documentation the visitors were unable to identify how students would be taught and be able to use standardised psychometric instruments. From the tour and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed that due to the entry requirements, students would have gained knowledge about standardised psychometric instruments prior to the start of the programme. The visitors felt that students would have knowledge of these areas but would not necessarily 'be able to select and use...' this knowledge.

The visitors were concerned that students may not be able to meet all the SOPs and therefore need to see evidence as to how the programme team ensure that students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs outlined above.

#### **4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that the integration of theory and practice is central to the curriculum.

**Reason:** From the review of documentation the visitors could not determine how theory and practice were integrated within the programme. The visitors learnt from the meetings with the students and the programme team that the courses which made up module PSYD053 would normally be taken in year 1 but could be taken in year 2. For example, Course 2 (Professional competence and Ethics in Health Psychology) would normally be undertaken in year 1, semester 2. However, the students highlighted cases where in the past some of the courses which would normally be run in year 1, had been run in year 2. The visitors felt this could mean that students would be undertaking a placement before they had learnt about the behaviour expected of them on their placement. The visitors therefore felt that the integration of theory and practice was not central to the curriculum and require further information to show how this standard continues to be met.

#### **4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that students are taught about and understand the implications of HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

**Reason:** From the review of documentation, the visitors learnt that in week 1, Course 2 (Professional Competence and Ethics in Health Psychology) students would 'consider the concepts of ethics and law and how to apply these to research and practice in health psychology'. As part of this, students discussed the British Psychological Society (BPS) Code of Ethics and Conduct (2009) and BPS Ethical Principles for Conducting Research with Human Participants (2009) and HPC's SOPs. The visitors felt that while the SOPs inform a student about the standards they need to meet to practise safely and effectively, they do not inform students about the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) HPC expects individuals to continue to meet once they are on the HPC Register. The visitors were concerned that there was no mention of these standards in the

module descriptor or other programme documentation and they were therefore unsure about how the students would understand the implications of HPC's SCPEs. The visitors would therefore like to receive further documentation illustrating how students will be taught about and understand the implications of the SCPEs.

### **5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that practice placements are integral to the programme.

**Reason:** From the Placement learning handbook the visitors learnt that 'there is no absolute requirement for students to undertake a period of supervised practice on placement in order to successfully complete the Pg Cert [element of the approved programme].' If a student works within the NHS or a comparable health related post while completing their PhD research there may be no requirement for them to complete a period of supervised practice as they are 'likely to find that their current post offers sufficient opportunities to develop and demonstrate their competence in health psychology practice.' The visitors also learnt that 'Certain knowledge, skills and competences may be most effectively gained from direct exposure to practice' and that it '...has some very specific objectives...' (Postgraduate Certificate in Health Psychology Practice: Placement Learning Handbook, page 6). The visitors discussed this with the programme team and, as outlined in the condition against SET 3.2, they heard about a number of different placement types. The visitors also learnt that the placement location and structure for each student was determined based on their prior knowledge and their choice of research topic. This meant that there was no minimum requirement which all students on the programme must undertake and as outlined in the Placement learning handbook this could mean that they did not need to undertake a period of supervised practice.

Practice placements are an important element of all HPC approved programmes and the education provider has overall responsibility for placement learning and ensuring that suitable systems are in place to support it. The visitors were concerned that practice placements were not a mandatory component of the programme and felt that practice placements were not integral to the programme. The visitors therefore require receive further information about the programme structure, showing how the placements are integral to the programme to ensure this standard continues to be met.

### **5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that the number, duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

**Reason:** As outlined in the conditions against SET 3.2 and SET 5.1, the visitors were unable to determine which practice placements were mandatory for the programme as the placement structure depended on an individual's prior knowledge and research topic. From the documentation the visitors learnt that

'...there is no pre-specified length to the period of placement learning'. As a result of this, the visitors were unable to determine the number, length or differing areas of placement experience. The visitors appreciate the flexible nature of the programme and that it is tailored to individual students' needs. However, they were concerned that the education provider did not identify the minimum requirement for all students in terms of learning outcomes or the number, duration and range of practice placements in order to obtain these learning outcomes. The visitors would therefore require further documentation outlining the programme structure, showing the number, duration and range for students to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

### **5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that all practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

**Reason:** From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted the Placement Health and Safety Checklist which had to be completed prior to the start of a placement. The visitors could see that placement providers were asked about their health and safety policies; risk assessments; and procedures for reporting accidents and incidents. However, from discussions with the placement providers and programme team, the visitors were unable to determine the process in place to review the answers provided on the checklist. For example, if a placement stated that they had not implemented the results of any risk assessment, would additional investigations be carried out or could this stop the student going on that placement? The visitors were also concerned that the check list was completed by a member of practice placement provider, not by a member of the programme team who could independently verify the placement setting provided a safe and supportive environment. The visitors therefore felt that the current systems did not ensure that placements provided a safe and supportive environment. Therefore the visitors require further documentation to show how the programme continues to meet this standard.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements is in place.

**Reason:** From the documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that a Placement Health and Safety Checklist had to be completed prior to the start of the placement. The visitors were concerned that the checklist concentrated on health and safety and no further process was provided to show how the education provider approves and monitors all placements. For example, as outlined in the conditions against SETs 3.8, 3.9, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7 and 5.9, the visitors could not identify how the programme team ensured that the placements were appropriate; provided the student with appropriate resources to support their learning and development; were safe; or were staffed by appropriately qualified, experienced or registered staff.

The education provider has overall responsibility to ensure that placement learning provides students with the ability to meet the relevant learning outcomes and to ensure that suitable systems are in place to support this. The visitors felt that the current systems did not provide a thorough or effective system to approve and monitor all placements and they require further information to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

#### **5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place together with an indication of how these are implemented and monitored.

**Reason:** From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Placement Health and Safety Checklist had to be completed prior to the start of the placement. This form did not seek to determine whether the placement provider had equality and diversity policies in place or determine how they were implemented or monitored. The programme team acknowledged that they did not check this. Therefore the visitors require additional evidence which demonstrates how this is undertaken to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

#### **5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at all placements to support students in their learning in a safe environment.

**Reason:** From the documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that a Placement Health and Safety Checklist had to be completed prior to the start of each placement. The focus of the checklist was health and safety and no further processes were provided to show how the education provider ensured that there was an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement.

From discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that a newly qualified individual would not be an ideal Workplace Supervisor. If this was the situation additional support would be put in place to help support the Supervisor. The visitors were unable to identify the minimum number which the education provider considered to be adequate or the appropriate qualifications or experience. The visitors were also unable to determine how the education provider then ensured that these criteria were met. Therefore the visitors require documentation which outlines how the education provider ensures that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at all placement's to support students in their learning in a safe environment.

#### **5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that Workplace Supervisors have the relevant, knowledge, skills and experience to support students and provide a safe environment for their learning.

**Reason:** From the documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that a Placement Health and Safety Checklist had to be completed prior to the start of each placement. No further processes were provided to show how the education provider ensured that practice placement educators had the relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

From discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that a newly qualified individual would not be an ideal Workplace Supervisor. If this was the situation additional support would be put in place to help support the Supervisor. The visitors were unable to identify what the education provider considered to be relevant knowledge, skills or experience including what programme specific knowledge was required of the workplace supervisor. The visitors were also unable to determine how the education provider then ensured that these criteria were met. Therefore the visitors would need to receive further documentation which outlines how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience necessary to supervise students while on practice placement.

#### **5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

**Reason:** From the documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that a Placement Health and Safety Checklist had to be completed prior to the start of each placement. No further processes were provided to show how the education provider ensured that practice placement educators had the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. As outlined in the condition against SET 5.7, the visitors could not determine what programme specific knowledge, skills and experience were required of the workplace supervisor and then how the education provider ensured this.

From discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers, the visitors learnt that Workplace Supervisors were not required to undertake any training prior to a student starting their placement. A Practice Learning Handbook was provided to all students and Workplace Supervisors. The visitors felt written support alone could be open to interpretation and therefore was not sufficient to ensure consistency of support and approach among the different Workplace Supervisors. The visitors felt that Workplace Supervisors should receive relevant training to ensure that all students have as consistent experience as practicably possible when trying to achieve the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require evidence of what the programme team considers appropriate workplace supervisor training and how the team will check that this requirement is met in order to show how this standard continues to be met.

#### **5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** From the documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that a Placement Health and Safety Checklist had to be completed prior to the start of each placement. No further processes were provided to show how the education provider ensured that Workplace Supervisors are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

From discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that a newly qualified individual would not be an ideal Workplace Supervisor. If this was the situation additional support would be put in place to help support the Supervisor. The visitors were unable to identify what the education provider considered to be appropriate registration for a Workplace Supervisor or how the programme team then ensured this. Therefore the visitors require additional documentation to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators are appropriately registered to ensure this standard continues to be met.

#### **5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.**

**Condition:** The education provider must formalise the ongoing collaboration between the programme team and the practice placement providers.

**Reason:** Within the practice placement providers meeting the visitors heard about the developing relationship between the practice placement providers and the programme team. Both placement providers were happy with the way in which they could contact the programme leader and discuss possible placement settings or ask questions. However, these were not formal processes and were undertaken as and when needed. In addition as outlined in the conditions against SET 3.3 and 5.4 the visitors were concerned that the programme team did not have in place formal processes to monitor and evaluate the Pg Cert element of the programme or approve and monitor placements. The visitors therefore felt that the education provider must provide evidence of formal collaboration between the programme team and practice placement providers to ensure this standard continues to be met.

#### **5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that workplace supervisors and students are fully prepared for placements.



**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that workplace supervisors were not required to undertake any training prior to a student starting their placement. As outlined in the condition against SET 4.3 the visitors learnt that there was a possibility that students could undertake a placement prior to undertaking the relevant academic course or module. If this occurred, the visitors felt that students may not have learnt about the behaviour expected of them on their placement. A Placement Learning Handbook is provided to students and practice placement educators. The visitors felt that written support alone could be open to interpretation amongst students and practice placement educators. The visitors therefore require evidence of how the programme team ensures that students and practice placement educators are appropriately prepared for placement..

**6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revise the programme documentation to clearly identify how the assessment strategy and design allows all students to meet the following standards of proficiency (SOPs);

- **1a.1 be able to practise within the legal and ethical boundaries of their profession**
  - **understand what is required of them by the Health Professions Council**
  
- **2a.2 be able to select and use appropriate assessment techniques**
  - **be able to use formal assessment procedures (standardised psychometric instruments), systematic interviewing procedures and other structured methods of assessments (eg interviews)**

**Reason:** From the review of documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors could not determine how students were taught about and assessed to show their understanding of what HPC required of them in terms of their legal and ethical boundaries. As outlined in the condition against SET 4.5, the SCPEs were not mentioned within the programme documentation.

From the documentation, the visitors were unable to identify how students would be taught about and assessed to show they are able to use standardised psychometric instruments. From the tour and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed that due to the entry requirements, students would have gained knowledge about standardised psychometric instruments prior to the start of the programme. The visitors were concerned as they felt that students would have knowledge of these areas but would not necessarily 'be able to select and use...' this knowledge.

The visitors were therefore concerned that students may not be able to meet all the SOPs and would therefore like to receive revised programme documentation which clearly outlines how the assessment strategy and design ensures that students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs outlined above.

## **6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that the measure of student performance is objective and ensures fitness to practice.

**Reason:** From the documentation the visitors could not identify the learning outcomes and assessment strategy for students while on placement. From the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that prior to the start of each placement the Pg Cert Supervisor, Workplace Supervisor and student meet to agree the Placement learning contract. The Placement learning contract outlines the overall goals and objectives of the placement but does not detail the learning outcomes which are expected to be met while in the placement. The Pg Cert Supervisor monitors the student through telephone conversations; a visit to the site and a review of a reflexive report written by the student at the end of the placement. The programme team confirmed that no individuals at the placements were responsible for supervising the student with the aim of observing and signing off learning outcomes. The visitors were concerned that the main assessment tool for placements was the review of a reflexive piece of work and not observation of a student within the placement. The visitors therefore felt that this was not an objective measure of student performance and could not ensure fitness to practice. The visitors would therefore like to receive further evidence to show how this standard continues to be met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that the assessment regulations for the Pg Cert element of the programme clearly specify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

**Reason:** From the review of the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine the assessment regulations for placements. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that for the PhD element of the programme, the PhD Supervisor held six monthly student review meetings to monitor their progress. The visitors learnt that for the Pg Cert element of the programme there was no requirement for the student to write a progress report and informal meetings would be held with the student. The visitors were concerned as they felt that there was a possibility that students could reach the end of their placement and learn at that point, that they had failed the learning outcomes of the placement. The visitors felt the assessment regulations for the Pg Cert element of the programme must be clearly outlined so that all involved know the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to ensure that this is the case and that this standard continues to be met.

Lynn Dunwoody  
George Delafield

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme name</b>	Doctorate in Educational Psychology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Educational psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	16 – 17 June 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Educational psychologist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 22 July 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 22 July 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2011.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Practitioner psychologist profession came onto the register in 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Peter Branston (Educational psychologist) Trevor Holme (Educational psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	12
First approved intake	1 January 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Peter Smith (University of Southampton)
Secretary	Sean Withall (University of Southampton)
Members of the joint panel	Graham Pratt (British Psychological Society) Julie Hardy (British Psychological Society) Frances Lee (British Psychological Society) Dilanthi Weerasinghe (British Psychological Society)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide clearly articulated documentation that will allow a potential applicant to make an informed choice as to whether to take up a place on the programme.

**Reason:** In the documentation provided before the visit, the visitors could not see where it was clearly documented that trainees were required by the education provider to maintain their own health throughout the programme and how the trainee would report any change to their health status to the programme team.

The visitors considered that this was an important element for a potential applicant to consider when applying to the programme in terms of the psychological status of an applicant.

In the meeting with the trainees, the visitors discussed the issue of maintaining their own health and well-being for the duration of the programme. It was clear that the trainees had received a copy of HPC's guidance on conduct and ethics for students and knew that the education provider expected them to tell the programme team if their health status changed in any way.

The programme team confirmed that health issues were discussed with potential applicants during the interview process and the applicants were advised to consider the maintenance for their health and well-being throughout the duration of the programme.

Whilst the visitors were happy that trainees were made aware of maintaining their health and well-being throughout the duration of the programme, they considered that it was not clearly articulated in the admissions documentation for the programme. Therefore the visitors want to receive revised documentation that clearly identifies the health and well-being requirements for the programme, to allow a potential applicant to make an informed choice as to whether to take up a place on the programme and for the education provider to offer a place on the programme regarding compliance with any health requirements.

### **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence that an appropriate protocol is in place to gain trainee consent where they may participate as service users.

**Reason:** In the documentation received prior to the visit the protocol was listed as proposed.

In the meeting with the trainees, the visitors asked if they had signed any form giving their consent to participate as a service user at any point whilst on the



programme. The students reported that they had not signed any form but they had been asked to give verbal affirmation that they were happy to participate in role play activity. The programme team and students, in their respective meetings, considered that by signing up to the programme trainees were consenting to participate in activities in the role of service users. They considered that the seeking of consent was implicit and that the ethos was there. The visitors learned that although there were discussions and awareness of the issue, there was no protocol in place to gain the informed consent of trainees to participate as service users.

The visitors were not satisfied the programme gained informed consent from trainees. Therefore the visitors require clarification of how trainees give their informed consent for participation and manage potential emotional distress, and how the proposed protocol is to be implemented to meet this standard.

Peter Branston  
Trevor Holme

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Teesside University
<b>Programme name</b>	Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DCounsPsy)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Counselling psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	23 – 24 June 2011

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

## Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Counselling psychologist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 5 August 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 August 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 14 October 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 6 December 2011.

## Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner psychology profession came onto the register in July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	George Delafield (Occupational and Forensic psychologist) Dave Packwood (Counselling psychologist) Dugald MacInnes (Lay visitor)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	22
First approved intake	1 January 2002
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2011
Chair	Judith Porch (Teesside University)
Secretary	Colin Straker (Teesside University)
Members of the joint panel	Kimberley Smith (British Psychological Society) Naomi Miller (British Psychological Society) Robert Night (British Psychological Society)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

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 meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

## Conditions

### **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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants are made aware of any likely additional costs associated with the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with students and programme team the visitors noted that students may be expected to self-fund a number of additional elements associated with taking up a place on the programme. In particular the visitors noted that there were additional costs incurred by students when they covered their own personal therapy and supervisor fees. The visitors noted in discussions with students that the costs associated with personal therapy and supervisor fees were not set and as such could be variable. The visitors also noted, in discussions with the programme team, that only some students would be required to pay for supervision and that the programme team offers support and guidance to students seeking personal therapy. However, in reviewing the programme documentation the visitors found no reference to any potential additional costs associated with the programme or any mention of the support and guidance available from the education provider. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clearly state the potential additional costs associated with the programme within the programme documentation. In this way the visitors can be sure that applicants to the programme have all the information they need to make an informed decision about taking up a place on the programme.

### **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.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation, including advertising material to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted a number of examples of out of date terminology or factually inaccurate statements. Within the 'Placement Agency Guidelines' (p16), it states that 'the HPC and BPS recommend that individual Psychologists have their own personal [liability insurance] cover in order to protect their own interests'. The HPC makes no such stipulation. The visitors also noted on the same page within the same document, with reference to criminal record checks, '...if information is revealed which may cast doubt on the honesty, integrity or safety of the Trainee and/or their clients this should be referred to the Programme Director (Allan Winthrop) and the advice of the HPC and BPS will be sought as required / if appropriate'. The visitors note that the HPC does not register students and ultimately it is the education provider who is responsible for managing any admissions and/or professional related conduct issues related to the programme. The visitors

therefore require the education provider to remove this reference to the HPC and highlight to students that the Programme Director can escalate criminal record disclosures through the appropriate internal protocols.

The visitors also noted a number of inconsistencies within the programme documentation. In particular the visitors noted differing criteria throughout the documentation for becoming a practice placement educator. The visitors therefore require the documentation to be thoroughly reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

#### **6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors noted discussions with the programme team that outlined that changes were being made to the assessment regulations in line with HPC requirements. However, from the evidence presented at the visit the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation regarding aegrotat awards and that this is clearly accessible to students.

#### **6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that at least one of the external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. The visitors were happy that the current external examiner meets the requirement of the HPC. However this standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme must state that at least one external examiner appointed to the programme needs to be appropriately registered or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. Therefore the visitors require evidence that HPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the documentation, specifically in the programme regulations, to ensure that this standard is met.



## Recommendations

### **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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to ensure that the information that is made available to applicants, students and practice placement educators is clear and consistent and fully reflects the policies and protocols that the programme team adhere to.

**Reason:** As a result of discussions at the visit visitors were satisfied that the programme and the education provider have robust policies and protocols in place. However, from a review of the programme documentation designed specifically for students and practice placement educators, such as the 'Student Handbook', 'Placement Agency Guidelines' and 'Supervised Practice Handbook' the visitors felt that the robust nature of the education provider's policies and practice was not always well reflected. The visitors noted that policies, such as that in regard of student disclosure of a criminal record, were dealt with through the utilisation of education provider wide procedures. However, this was not reflected in the 'Placement Agency Guidelines' where it was stated that the Programme Director reviewed information in relation to student criminal records and contacted the HPC if required. The visitors also noted strong verbal responses to questions around monitoring of equality and diversity and reasonable adjustments. Therefore the visitors recommend that the documentation available to applicants, students and practice placement educator is further enhanced by ensuring that all the information they receive is reflective of the way the programme is delivered and consistent in line with the education providers overarching policies and procedures. In this way the programme team can ensure that the policies and procedures utilised by the programme are clearly understood by those who may use them.

### **2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the professional entry standards for the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied that this standard is met. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors note that one of the entry requirements is stated as 'relevant therapeutic/counselling experience is also desirable, e.g. NHS Psychology Assistant, paid or voluntary counselling work'. The visitors also noted discussions with the programme team where the programme team further clarified the interpretation of this entry criterion and offered further detail on how it was applied at admissions. In light of the discussions with the programme team the visitors recommend that the education provider may want to review this entry standard to further enhance its clarity to applicants to the programme as well as ensure consistency in the selection process.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the mechanisms in place for gaining student feedback.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were satisfied that there were regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place for the programme and therefore that this standard is met. However the visitors did note that the percentage of student who feedback and evaluate teaching was variable across the programme. The visitors also noted discussions with the programme team where it was stated that the education provider has adopted an online system for gaining student feedback and since this system was implemented student participation has decreased. The visitors recommend the education provider reviews the mechanisms in place for gaining student feedback, and further highlight the importance of this process to students.

### **4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider formulating strategic approach to the integration of service users into the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were satisfied that the range of learning and teaching approaches used are appropriate to the effective delivery of the programme. Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that service users are involved in some teaching sessions within the programme. The visitors also noted discussions with the programme team about plans to further integrate service users into the programme. The visitors recommend that the programme team may want to formulate a strategic approach to the integration of service users to further enhance the range of learning and teaching approaches used in the programme by integrating service users into areas such as admissions, assessment, curriculum design and teaching.

### **5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider formulating additional protocols to further support the process of auditing, approving and monitoring practice placements.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. The visitors noted evidence of a clear placement audit and monitoring mechanisms. However, the visitors recommend that the education provider may want to consider developing additional protocols to further support the process of auditing, approving and monitoring practice placements. The visitors feel that the introduction of additional protocols and guidelines will enhance the transparency and consistency of the placement audit process and allow the programme team to clearly define and document what they consider to be a placement setting that does not offer a safe and supportive environment.

George Delafield  
Dave Packwood  
Dugald MacInnes