

Visitors' report

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Name of education provider | Canterbury Christ Church University |
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Paramedic |
| Date of visit | 25 - 26 November 2010 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| Contents | 1 |
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| 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 'Paramedic' 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 6 January 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 16 February 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 13 January 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 16 February 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 education provider considered their validation of 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 | Vince Clarke (Paramedic) Glyn Harding (Paramedic) |
| HPC executive officer (in attendance) | Benjamin Potter |
| Proposed student numbers | 15 |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | April 2011 |
| Chair | Chris Stevens (Canterbury Christ Church University) |
| Secretary | Samantha Ray (Canterbury Christ Church University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Sarah Jardine (External panel member) Andrew Utterson (Internal panel member) Fiona McArthur-Rouse (Internal 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 from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner 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) Radiography and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy 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 45 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 12 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

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 material to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC 'accrediting' the programme, that HPC sets certain requirements regarding practice hours and that the HPC is a professional body. The HPC does not 'accredit' education programmes instead we 'approve' education programmes, HPC does not set a requirement regarding practice hours and the HPC is a statutory regulator not a professional body. The visitors considered the terminology to be misleading to applicants and students and therefore required the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout.

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must revisit all relevant instances in programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the English-language entry criteria are clear.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted it was not clear what the English-language requirements were on entry to the programme. It was also not apparent what International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level was applicable on entry to the programme. At the visit, discussions with the programme team indicated that this should be level 6.5. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the programme documentation clearly states the English-language requirements on entry to the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to ensure that information relating to selection and entry criteria, particularly regarding compliance with any health requirements, is available to applicants.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the education provider had in place admissions procedures and entry criteria in relation to the programme, including a process for applying health checks. However in discussion with the programme team it was unclear where a potential applicant would be able to obtain information about the fitness test prior to

undertaking the test. The visitors therefore required the education provider to revise their advertising material and documentation to identify where an applicant to the programme can gain information about the fitness test prior to undertaking it. This would enable a potential applicant to make an informed decision about applying to the programme and ensure that this standard continues to be met.

3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that the named person who has overall responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

Reason: The visitors noted that there has been a recent appointment of a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme. While the visitors were satisfied that he was in post they had no evidence to determine if he is appropriately qualified and experienced. The visitors therefore require evidence to ensure that he is appropriately qualified and experienced and that the support offered to him by the education provider to undertake the role is suitable.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate how the profession specific learning and teaching will be delivered by both the programme team and any external contributors to the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted, in discussion with the programme team, that the newly appointed person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is to take the lead on delivering the profession specific teaching and learning. The visitors also noted that there had been a budget allocated to provide external expertise to deliver some profession specific teaching. However, the visitors were unsure as to how this external expertise would be used and how the profession specific knowledge would be delivered throughout the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence of how external expertise will be utilised to ensure that the profession specific teaching and learning will be delivered throughout the programme. This is to ensure that the relevant subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge and that 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 provide evidence that the practical experience undertaken by students on the programme allow students to meet the relevant learning outcomes as articulated in the modules descriptors.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that the practice assessment document (PAD) was used by the programme team to assess students' practical experience. In discussion with the programme team and with the practice placement educators, the visitors noted that the skills assessment articulated within the document had not been split to fit into the three year structure of the programme. In discussion with the programme team it was clear that this document is to be revised to clearly associate particular practical skills with particular years, or stages, of the programme. In this way there will be modules and particular learning outcomes delivered in one year which will be associated with specific parts of the PAD. As the PAD is to be revised the visitors require an updated document which clearly articulates how the practical skills obtained over a particular year will allow students to meet the learning outcomes associated with the modules taught in that year and subsequently the relevant standards of proficiency (SOPs).

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 what the learning and assessment requirements for each placement are in each different type of practice placement situation.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team and practice placement educators it was clear that placements are an integral part of the programme with almost 50% of profession specific learning being delivered in a placement environment. The visitors also noted that practice placements not in an ambulance trust environment were not summatively assessed and would not contribute to the assessment of a students' practical skill. It was also clarified that these practice placements would be occurring in tandem with practice placements within an ambulance trust environment. However the visitors were not clear how the assessment for these different types of placements were undertaken and what learning outcomes were associated with them.

The visitors were also unclear as to the range and duration of non ambulance placements. During the meetings with the programme team and practice placements it was clear that placements took place in paediatrics, maternity and coronary care units. However no detail regarding these placements had been included in the documentation provided.

The visitors therefore require clarification of what the learning outcomes associated with the different types of practice placements, as well as the different types of placements to be undertaken, are to ensure that this standard can 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 articulate what students are expected to achieve while on each of the different placements; what assessment procedures will be in place; and what the implications of any failure of assessment may be.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team and practice placement providers the visitors noted that students would attend several different types of practice placement. The visitors also noted that some of these placements were formatively assessed while some were assessed with a summative assessment at the end of each year. However the visitors were unclear as to how the required learning outcomes and necessary practical experience to be achieved by students on individual placements were communicated to students and practice placement educators. They were also unclear as to how the assessment requirements for each placement, as well as the implications this would have for students' progression if they failed a placement, were communicated to students and practice placement educators. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how students and practice placement educators are provided with information regarding placement specific learning outcomes and assessment. This is to ensure that all of those involved in the practice placement are fully prepared before the practice placement is undertaken and that this standard can 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 provide an updated and complete practice placement handbook.

Reason: In the documentation provided the visitors noted that there were areas of the practice placement handbook that required further information, revision or updating. In discussion with the programme team it was identified that further work was to be undertaken to revise this document. The visitors therefore require an updated and complete practice placement handbook to determine if students and practice placement educators are provided with sufficient information to prepare them to undertake a practice 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 provide evidence that the assessment of practical experience undertaken by students on the programme allow students to meet the relevant learning outcomes as articulated in the modules descriptors.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that the PAD was used by the programme team to assess students' practical experience. In discussion with the programme team and with the practice placement educators, the visitors noted that the skills assessment articulated within the document had not been split to fit into the three year structure of the programme. In discussion with the programme team it was clear that this document is to be revised to clearly associate the assessment of particular practical skills with particular years, or stages, of the programme which will determine progression through the programme. As the PAD is to be revised the visitors require an updated document which clearly articulates how the assessment of practical skills undertaken over a particular year will ensure that students meet the learning outcomes associated with the modules taught in that year and can subsequently meet the relevant standards of proficiency (SOPs).

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

Condition: The education provider must articulate how the objective structured clinical education (OSCE) assessment will be employed to measure the learning outcomes associated with them.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a number of the learning outcomes were to be assessed by utilising OSCE assessments. The visitors also noted that these assessments also influence how the South East Coast Ambulance Service NHS Trust (SECAMB) skills passport will be utilised and how this will subsequently affect a students' scope of practice while on practice placement. However the visitors could not determine the scope of the OSCEs, what they involve and how they relate to the un-assessed SECAMB skills passport. The visitors therefore require evidence of the scope of the OSCEs, how they measure learning outcomes and how they then relate to the skills passport. This is to ensure that the OSCEs measure the stated learning outcomes, that students will be able to meet the relevant SOPs and that this standard can be met.

In discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a number of the learning outcomes were to be assessed by utilising OSCE assessments. However the visitors could not determine how the OSCEs would measure the standards of proficiency.

The visitors therefore require evidence of the scope of the OSCEs and how they measure learning outcomes. This is to ensure that the OSCEs measure the stated learning outcomes, to enable students to meet the relevant SOPs and meet this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must articulate how the skills delivered by the OSCEs will be objectively assessed to ensure fitness to practice.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a number of the learning outcomes were to be assessed by utilising OSCE assessments. The visitors also noted that if students did not have the necessary experience on practice placement then any shortfall would be delivered at the education provider using a tailored OSCE session and assessment. However the visitors could not determine how assessments of the OSCEs were determined and how the programme team ensured consistency across the assessment of this teaching. The visitors therefore require evidence of how the assessment of OSCEs is formulated, what degree of practice shortfall can be measured by OSCE assessment and how the programme team ensure that the learning outcomes associated with them are consistently assessed.

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

Condition: The education provider must articulate the requirements placed on students during different practice placements and what the implications of failing a placement may be on a students' progression.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that the PAD was used by the programme team to assess students' practical experience. The programme team articulated that the PAD is to be revised to ensure that there are clear learning outcomes associated the practical experience undertaken by a student in a particular year. However the visitors could not determine what practical experience needed to be undertaken, assessed and passed before a student could progress from one year to the next. As the PAD is to be revised the visitors require evidence to demonstrate how the learning outcomes to be delivered on practice placement are clearly articulated to students and practice placement educators. This is to provide sufficient information for everyone involved in the practice placement to be aware of the requirements placed on students to pass a practice placement. This is to ensure that the students subject to these assessments will be able to meet the relevant SOPs for paramedics and that this standard can 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 education provider should consider clarifying for applicants to the programme if there is an entry requirement for a full clean driving license.

Reason: In discussion with the practice placement educators, the senior team and the programme team the visitors noted that the programme currently has a requirement for applicants to the programme to have a full clean driving license. However, the visitors also noted that the programme does not have a compulsory requirement for students to undertake driving teaching, learning or assessment. They also noted that the programme team were considering the removal of the requirement for applicants to have a full clean driving license. The visitors therefore recommend that if this requirement for applicants to the programme is changed that the information provided to applicants is updated to reflect the new requirements.

Glyn Harding
Vince Clarke

Visitors' report

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Name of education provider | Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd) |
| Programme name | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy) |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Practitioner psychologist |
| Relevant modality / domain | Clinical psychologist |
| Date of visit | 21 – 22 October 2010 |

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 '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 17 December 2010 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 16 February 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 19 January 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 16 February 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 also 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 | Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) Peter Branston (Educational psychologist) |
| HPC executive officer | Lewis Roberts |
| Proposed student numbers | 10 |
| Initial approval | 1 January 1993 |
| Chair | David Lloyd (Cardiff University(Prifysgol Caerdydd)) |
| Secretary | Karen Moore (Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)) |
| Members of the joint panel | Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society) Helen Dent (British Psychological Society) Gundi Kiemle (British Psychological Society) Lorna Farquharson (British Psychological Society) Matthias Schwannauer (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 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

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation and produce clear policies and procedures to support the approval and monitoring of new placements.

Reason: From the documents submitted and from discussions with the programme team the visitors did not have enough evidence to demonstrate that the education provider has a thorough and effective system in place for the approval and monitoring of new placements. The visitors noted that the education provider does have mechanisms in place to monitor the quality of placements and does audit placements; however they noted that these approval and monitoring mechanisms are retrospective and potentially allowed trainees to go in to a new placement setting without it being formally approved by the education provider. The visitors require the education provider to produce evidence as to how they ensure that all new placements are audited before a trainee goes on to placement to demonstrate that the education provider is responsible for the learning outcomes to be delivered on practice placements..

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate the mechanism they use to ensure that practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training in advance of receiving trainees and how they decide when practice placement educators require refresher training.

Reason: From the documents submitted and from discussions with the programme team and trainees the visitors noted that the education provider does offer practice placement educator training to practice placement educators. However, from discussions with the trainees the visitors noted that not all practice placement educators had received practice placement educator training. The programme team confirmed to the visitors that practice placement educator training was not mandatory. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that all practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training in advance of receiving trainees. The visitors require clarification on how the education provider records and monitors the training of new practice placement educators and information on how it is determined if a practice placement educator needs refresher training and how this is articulated to the relevant parties. 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 revisit the programme documentation to ensure consistency with the university assessment regulations.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from a review of the university assessment regulations the visitors noted a number of disparities. The visitors require the programme documentation to be consistent with the university assessment regulations so that trainees understand what is expected of them at each stage of the programme and that trainees are clear about what is expected of them in terms of progression and achievement within the programme. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is being met and that trainees are clear about what constitutes a failure on the programme.

Recommendations

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 forming an outline or action plan to demonstrate how the programme team's strategies for widening access to the profession of clinical psychology will be implemented.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the senior management and the programme team the visitors noted evidence of an equality and diversity policy and evidence of the education provider implementing and monitoring this policy. The visitors were happy that the requirements of the HPC relating to this standard were being met. The visitors did however note that the programme team had produced a document called *Review of programme strategies for widening access to the profession of clinical psychology*. The education provider should consider outlining how the strategies identified by the programme team will be implemented in an outline or action plan to demonstrate the implementation of these strategies.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the structures and support mechanisms that are in place to encourage trainees to provide honest and critical feedback about the programme and practice placements.

Reason: From the documentation and from discussions at the visit the visitors were happy that the requirements of the HPC relating to this standard were being met. The visitors did however note a number of points that came up in the meeting with the trainees. Some trainees expressed concern that they did not always feel comfortable offering critical feedback to the course team and that the structures and support mechanisms in place did not always allow them to do this. Some trainees also perceived that feedback from trainees and practice placement educators were not always responded to by the programme team in an equitable way. The visitors recommend that the programme team may want to revisit the mechanisms it uses to gain feedback from trainees and review the way in which the programme team responds to this feedback to ensure that the process is transparent, equitable and that trainees feel that feedback has been listened and responded to.

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Recommendation The education provider should consider working towards more formal arrangements with practice placements.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team and senior management the visitors noted that the education provider does not have formal arrangements in place with practice

placement providers. After discussions with the senior management team the visitors noted that trainee numbers are commissioned annually from NHS Wales. The visitors recommend the education provider engages in discussions at a strategic level with commissioners and practice placement providers to work towards more formal arrangements, to ensure the quality and consistency of placement provision across all settings.

6.3 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider offering trainees additional support to ensure that trainees are able to effectively give and receive feedback both within the programme but also in practice.

Reason: From the documentation and from discussions at the visit the visitors were happy that the requirements of the HPC relating to this standard were being met. The visitors did however note a number of points that came up in the meeting with the trainees. Some trainees expressed concern that they did not always feel comfortable offering critical feedback to the course team. The visitors note that the ability to give and receive feedback is a professional aspect of practice. The visitors recommend that the education provider may want to offer trainees additional support to encourage a feedback culture throughout the programme and encourage trainees (perhaps with a taught element) to give and receive effective feedback in all settings.

Sabiha Azmi
Peter Branston

Visitors' report

| | |
|--|---|
| Name of education provider | New College Durham |
| Validating body / Awarding body | Leeds Metropolitan University |
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Podiatry |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Chiropodist / Podiatrist |
| Relevant entitlement(s) | Local anaesthetic Prescription Only Medicine |
| Date of visit | 18 – 19 November 2010 |

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 'Chiropodist' or 'Podiatrist' 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 January 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 16 February 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 March 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 31 March 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 an HPC only visit. The education provider and validating body did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair for the visit.

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Anne Wilson (Chiropodist/Podiatrist) Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist/Podiatrist) |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Mandy Hargood |
| Proposed student numbers | 35 |
| Initial approval | 1 September 2006 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2011 |
| Chair | John Ellison (New College Durham) |

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 the programme and admissions documentation to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: The programme and admissions information submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by the HPC. In particular, there were instances of references to students on completion of the programme being able to apply for registration with the HPC rather than being 'eligible to apply for registration with the HPC.' Also the programme specification on page 2 made reference to HPC National Occupational Standards. The HPC does not have National Occupational Standards, these standards relate to the Skills for Health competencies. The visitors considered the terminology to be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require the programme and admissions documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology throughout. This will ensure that applicants have the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

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.

Condition: The education provider must submit revised documentation that includes information regarding their interim awards for this programme.

Reason: In the report of the validation event held by the education provider with the validating body, and the professional body in June 2010, it stated in the footnote that the step off awards for the Certificate of Higher Education, Diploma of Higher Education and the BSc Health Studies, could lead to "membership of the HPC". During the meeting with the programme team it was clear that the step off awards were not programmes that led to eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC and that this document had not been provided by the programme team.

The visitors considered that as this document was a public facing document it could lead to a misunderstanding as to what qualifications were eligible for registration with the HPC. Therefore the visitors would like to receive revised documentation that removes the statement relating to the step off awards leading to registration with the HPC and ensure that it is clear that only the BSc (Hons) Podiatry full time is the award that leads to eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC.

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.

Recommendations

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider exploring opportunities with the validating institution for the programme to develop interprofessional and multi-disciplinary professional experience for the students.

Reason: Whilst the visitors were content that this standard was met, they considered that there were greater opportunities for inter professional learning for the students by developing the relationship with the other health profession programmes at the validating institution as well as medical specialist departments in the NHS acute trust and, other Universities in the region, and especially the validating University that offer other Health and Medicine awards

In the meeting with the students, the students expressed a desire to forge closer links with Leeds Metropolitan University to broaden their experience. The visitors considered that the enthusiasm expressed by the students should be utilised positively, especially as there was little opportunity for the students to gain interprofessional or multi-disciplinary skills within the New College Durham Campus.

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the formal monitoring of the student experience on the practice placements to ensure that placement practice experience is consistent and equitable as far as practicable to all students equitable.

Reason: The visitors were content that this standard was met, and that the students were experiencing the number, duration and range of practice placements to allow them to complete the programme.

In the meeting with the students, the students said that they kept a diary of the placements they attended. The visitors asked if this was reviewed by the programme team and the response was no as it was for their own reflection. A view was expressed by the students that their placement experience could be different and the visitors felt that in order for the institution to ensure the experience is consistent and equitable this experience should be monitored. The opportunity for this exists through the students existing placement diary they keep.

The visitors recommended that the programme team review the diaries to keep under review the placements taken by students. By doing this the visitors considered that the education provider would be aware of the placements being undertaken by students and that student experience of placements was equitable.

Anne Wilson
Paul Blakeman

Visitors' report

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Name of education provider | University of Birmingham |
| Programme name | Clinical Psychology Doctorate (ClinPsyD) |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Practitioner psychologist |
| Relevant modality / domain | Clinical psychologist |
| Date of visit | 9 – 10 November 2010 |

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 10 December 2010 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 16 February 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 4 February 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 31 March 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 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 education provider and the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Ruth Baker (Clinical Psychologist) Peter Branston (Educational Psychologist) |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Mandy Hargood |
| Proposed student numbers | 28 |
| Initial approval | 1 January 1992 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2011 |
| Chair | David Stephenson (University of Birmingham) |
| Secretary | Joyce Peters (University of Birmingham) |
| Members of the joint panel | Chris McCusker (British Psychological Society) Posy Knights (British Psychological Society) Jim Williams (British Psychological Society) Jane Tyler (British Psychological Society) Rupal Nathwani (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 a condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 56 of the SETs have been met and that a condition should be set on the remaining SET.

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

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 provide revised documentation that details how student profession-related conduct issues are communicated between the education provider and the practice placement providers.

Reason: During the meeting with the practice placement providers, they were unclear as to how student profession-related conduct issues were passed forward from the education provider to the next practice placement.

Currently if there is any student profession-related conduct issues, it is logged in the student log book and it is expected that the student will, by showing the log book to the next practice placement provider, pass this information forward.

At the meeting with the programme team it was evident to the visitors that the team were reflecting on this issue and are planning to update the placement documentation to ensure that student profession-related conduct issues will be disseminated to practice placements as the student moves from placement to placement to ensure this important issue is not missed.

Therefore the visitors would like to receive revised documentation to reflect this change and to ensure that this standard is met.

Ruth Baker
Peter Branston

Visitors' report

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Name of education provider | University of Hull |
| Programme name | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (ClinPsyD) |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Practitioner psychologist |
| Relevant modality / domain | Clinical psychologist |
| Date of visit | 20 - 21 January 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 '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 25 February 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 16 February 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 May 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 7 July 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 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 | Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| Proposed student numbers | 15 per cohort once a year |
| Initial approval | 1 January 1992 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | 26 September 2011 |
| Chair | Dina Lewis (University of Hull) |
| Secretary | Beverley Leak (University of Hull) |
| Members of the joint panel | Helen Dent (British Psychological Society) Ian Fleming (British Psychological Society) Eve Knight (British Psychological Society) Robert Knight (British Psychological Society) Molly Ross (British Psychological Society) Nikos Zygouris (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"/> |
| Programme documentation produced for visit | <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 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

3.15 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 revise programme documentation to clearly identify the minimum attendance requirements for time on placements and the associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit did not clearly specify the minimum attendance requirements or the associated monitoring mechanisms in place for trainees at placement. Discussions with the trainees indicated they knew the procedures to follow when absences were necessary however did not know the minimum requirement for their time on placement. Discussions with the programme team indicated there was a minimum requirement for time on placement but they could not confirm of the specific amount.

From the evidence received the visitors were not satisfied the minimum requirements were being fully communicated to the trainees, placement providers and teaching staff or were being monitored in a formal way. The visitors also noted that if all parties involved on placement were not aware of the threshold requirement, it would be difficult for the education provider to monitor and step in to take action to ensure absence does not affect a trainee's learning and development on placement. The visitors were concerned that this could affect the meeting of the learning outcomes and therefore the standards of proficiency,

The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be revised to communicate to trainees, placement staff and programme staff, the minimum attendance requirements for time on placements and the associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

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 provide further documentation which clearly outlines how all placement supervisors are fully prepared for each individual placement.

Reason: The placement documentation submitted prior to the visit described the necessary meetings for trainees at placement as the 'initial placement

contracting' meeting, a Mid-Placement Review (MPR) and an End of Placement Review (EPR). The 'initial placement contracting' meeting is used to draw up and sign a contract between the clinical supervisor and the trainee using the trainee's Placement Planning and Assessment Pack (PPAP) to identify goals and developmental needs to be addressed at the placement. The MPR are meetings halfway through the placement where the PPAP is reviewed by the trainee, clinical supervisor and clinical tutor to ensure the learning outcomes and developmental needs are being addressed fully. The EPR is where the placement is discussed between the trainee and clinical supervisor, the PPAP is then used to record placement outcomes and learning outcomes, goals and developmental needs to be addressed at the future placement. The trainee then takes their PPAP to their new placement clinical supervisor. Copies of the PPAP after the EPR and 'initial placement contracting' meeting are taken and sent to the clinical tutor but it falls solely to the trainee to take the PPAP information forward with their new placement supervisor.

Discussions with the trainees and placement supervisors confirmed the programme team did not become involved with the setting of the developmental goals at the initial stage of commencing the placements. It was the trainees responsibility to disclose information regarding their development at the 'initial placement contracting' meeting. Discussions with the trainees also highlighted that the PPAP was used in varying ways and sometimes not at all. Discussions with the trainees and placements supervisors additionally highlighted that it was only if there was a serious concern or incident in the previous placement would information be passed forward to alert the new placement at an early stage.

The visitors noted that there was a risk of trainees failing to alert placement supervisors to their developmental needs and in these circumstances it would only be at the MPR that significant areas which needed attention would be highlighted by the education provider. The visitors considered that to ensure all learning outcomes are addressed fully and in order for the trainee and clinical supervisor to be fully prepared for placements, the education provider must evidence how they are monitoring and ensuring that all learning outcomes are addressed at placements, throughout the placement period and from one placement experience to another.

The visitors therefore require further evidence which clearly articulates how the education provider will ensure each placement supervisor is fully prepared for each individual placement.

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 revise documentation to clearly communicate the assessment of practice placements.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit described assessment of the practice placement in terms of the trainee's Placement Planning and Assessment Pack (PPAP) and the Clinical Practice Evaluation (CPE). The documents were unclear as to how the assessment of the PPAP influences the overall assessments of placements. This is described as a formative assessment but it also states that it contributes "to the supervisors' judgement about trainee progress, which results in their (summative) decision to pass or fail the placement" (p58 The Doctorate in Clinical Psychology Handbook). Additionally the visitors noted that if there are two failed placements as a result of the PPAP the trainee is removed from the programme (p37, C12 - Supervisors Handbook). From this the visitors felt the documents were indicating that the PPAP outcome directly affects the trainee's status with the programme and as such it could not be considered a formative assessment. Discussions with the trainees and placement providers indicated that they were also unclear how the PPAP was linked to the overall assessment for as they felt the PPAP assessment was summative.

Discussions with the programme team clarified the purpose of the PPAP and how the assessments of both the PPAP and the CPE related to the overall assessment of clinical placements for the trainee. It was confirmed that the PPAP is a developmental tool and therefore has no grading system, rather the 'pass / fail' criteria are the markers for clinical supervisors to use to show the development of the trainee and are to always be used with the formative descriptions of the trainee's practice. The CPE is completely separate from the PPAP and is the summative assessment of the trainee's practice. In cases where the PPAP is marked as a 'fail', the outcomes of both the CPE and the PPAP are taken into consideration by a process which includes an external examiner being brought in to assess the situation on a case by case basis. This process is only used when the marks for the CPE and the PPAP differ.

The visitors were satisfied with the discussions and the processes described however were not satisfied this information was being communicated clearly for the trainees and clinical supervisors. Therefore the visitors require the programme team to revise all relevant placement documentation to clearly show the relationship between the assessments of the CPE and PPAP and the processes which link them to the overall assessment of the trainee.

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 furthering their engagement with the admissions procedures for the undergraduate programmes that this doctorate programme recruits from in order to encourage a diverse range of students on the programme.

Reason: The programme detailed its admissions procedures and stated that it only recruits trainees from the clinical psychology undergraduate programmes currently running at the University of Hull and the University of York. The trainees are selected whilst still on these undergraduate programmes and start immediately on this doctorate programme when they have completed the undergraduate programme. The visitors realise that with such a recruitment procedure it can be difficult to encourage a diverse range of persons for this programme as the 'selection pool' is limited by the undergraduate programmes. The visitors wish to recommend the programme team consider engaging further (such as informing potential applicants to the possibilities for this doctorate programme at open days or selection days) with the recruitment procedures for the undergraduate programmes to encourage as wide a 'selection pool' as possible for this programme.

3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.

Recommendation: The programme team may wish to consider formally implementing contingency procedures to support themselves in case the Course Director position is not recruited at the next round of appointments.

Reason: At the time of the visit the Course Director was planning to retire, although was remaining in post whilst a replacement was found. Discussions at the visit indicated the Course Director position was open to recruitment procedures and the programme team had plans in place for when they recruited the position in order to support the new Course Director. There was also discussion surrounding the plans if the Course Director was not recruited and acting-up positions would need to be created. The visitors were happy with the verbalised arrangements but would recommend the programme team formalise the arrangements to minimise disruption to the programme team if they are unable to recruit at this next stage. The visitors also wish to highlight to the programme team that when they do recruit a new Course Director the HPC will need to be informed appropriately.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend the programme team continues in their efforts to use service users in the development of the programme.

Reason: During discussion at the visit the programme team gave details of where in the programme service users are utilised. Service users were used at placements in direct work with trainees and also through teaching on the programme in modules. The programme team indicated they were looking to increase the use of service users to also inform the improvement and development of the programme. The visitors noted that to keep the curriculum relevant to current practice, service users were a useful tool and wish to support the programme team in their efforts to make more use of the service users to develop their programme.

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 programme team may wish to consider expanding the consent protocols used with service users at placement.

Reason: The documentation and discussions at the visit detailed consent protocols that are currently used at placements for informing service users' that trainees will be practising. The visitors wished to recommend that, along with obtaining consent for trainees to practice, the programme team also include obtaining consent for the service user experiences to be used during writing up of case studies in academic work. The visitors were happy that the information is made anonymous but felt service users could also be informed that they may be used as (anonymous) case studies in academic work. The visitors suggest this could be done in a variety of ways such as including it on a form to be completed and signed by the consenting service user or by including it in any discussion about consent between trainee and service user.

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

Recommendation: The programme team may wish to consider how they disseminate information regarding academic appeal procedures for all cohorts on the programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated the programme documentation did mention the academic appeals process in the form of a weblink to the process. Discussions with the trainees indicated that they were aware of the appeals process when it had affected someone in their cohort. They all were certain they would be able to find the information but were unsure where to look for it. In light of the fact that across the three years of the programme there were varying levels of knowledge about the appeals process the visitors

recommend the programme team consider further disseminating information about the appeals process throughout the programme (such as during inductions each year, adding further information to student documents or through regular updates).

Sabiha Azmi
Ruth Baker

Visitors' report

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Name of education provider | University of Southampton |
| Programme name | Independent and supplementary prescribing: prescribing in practice - Allied Health Professions |
| Mode of delivery | Part time |
| Relevant modality / domain | Radiographers Physiotherapists Chiropodists/Podiatrists |
| Relevant entitlement(s) | Supplementary prescribing |
| Date of visit | 14 December 2010 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Contents | 1 |
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Commendations..... | 7 |

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. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register, the HPC also approve a small number of programmes for those already on the Register. The post-registration programmes we currently approve are supplementary prescribing programmes (for chiropodists / podiatrists, radiographers and physiotherapists) and programmes in local anaesthetics and prescription-only medicine (for chiropodists / podiatrists).

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitor on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 11 January 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 16 February 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitor 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 11 January 2011. The visitor 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 16 February 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 standard standards of proficiency (SOP) for this entitlement.

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 visitor and profession | James Pickard (Podiatrist) |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Mandy Hargood |
| Proposed student numbers | 20 |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | April 2011 |
| Chair | Rosalynd Jowett (University of Southampton) |
| Secretary | Sara Dixon (University of Southampton) |
| Members of the joint panel | Neil Smyth (Internal Panel Member) Kerry Clarke (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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 SOPs mapping prior to the visit as a mapping document was not required by the visitor as the programme is a post-registration qualification.

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 Nurse Supplementary Prescribing Programme and one physiotherapy student who had completed the pharmacology unit, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitor 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 (SOP) for this entitlement.

The visitor 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 visitor 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 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 visitor 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 visitor has also made a commendation. 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 include the application form for this programme in all relevant documentation, to demonstrate all admissions criteria to be met, and to give an applicant the information they require to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit did not include the application form that applicants complete to apply for a place on the programme. During the meeting with the programme team, the application form was presented to the panel. The visitor and the team discussed its relevance, including how the Criminal Records Bureau and Health checks were made prior to admission to the programme, especially in relation to allied health professionals (AHPs) applying to the programme.

As this document had not been included in the documentation received prior to the visit, the visitor would like to receive revised documentation that includes the application form as it applies to AHPs making an application to the programme, to ensure that those applying to the programme have the required information to make an informed choice about whether to take up the offer of a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide programme documentation that includes the audit tool for maintaining and approving an effective system for approving and monitoring practice placements.

Reason: Prior to the visit the documentation including the SETs mapping document indicated monitoring of placements was not applicable. However in the meeting with the programme team it was discussed that there was a robust system of approving and monitoring placements in place for the programme. The programme leader provided a copy of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement.

As this audit tool was not included in the documentation received by the visitor prior to the visit, the visitor would like to receive revised programme documentation which includes this audit tool to demonstrate how practice placements are approved and monitored in relation to this programme to ensure that the audit tool is thorough and effective as an audit mechanism.

Commendations

The visitor wishes to commend the following aspects of the programme:

Commendation: The final examination taken by the students after they have completed their portfolio and work with the designated medical practitioner.

Reason: The visitor considered this to be an example of best practice as it shows the education provider is taking responsibility for the final assessment of the student as well as considering the work in the portfolio assessed by the designated medical practitioner. This was the first time that the visitor had seen a final examination within a Supplementary Prescribing programme. Usually the education provider relies on the judgment of the designated medical practitioner within the practice placement handbook. The visitor considered this to be a valuable asset to this programme and the visitor saw it as innovative.

Information about this can be found by contacting the Faculty of Health Sciences at the University of Southampton.

James Pickard