

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Leicester
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	12 -13 January 2011

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or '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 21 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 31 March 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 April 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 9 June 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	Harry Brick (Clinical psychologist) Stephen Davies (Clinical psychologist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort
Initial approval	January 1995
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	3 October 2011
Chair	Nigel Siesage (University of Leicester)
Secretary	Pamela Sawyer (University of Leicester)
Members of the joint panel	Nancy Pistrang (British Psychological Society) Andrew Cuthbertson (British Psychological Society) Andrew Vidgen (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society) Robert Knight (British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

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

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

Prior to the visit the HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years as the education provider submitted an external examiners' report for the academic year of 2008-2009. The education provider provided external examiners' reports for 2007-2008 and 2009-2010 at the visit itself.

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 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

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 programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme to include information about accreditation for prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policies for the programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included documents which would be available for the trainees of the programme and a supplementary evidence document which was created solely for the purpose of the visit. The detail about the use of the AP(E)L policies was described only in the supplementary evidence document and therefore was not available for the potential applicants or trainees on the programme. Discussions at the visit confirmed that the programme does not, and does not plan to, use AP(E)L policies for entry to the programme. The visitors were satisfied that the programme does not use AP(E)L policies the programme but were aware that this information should be communicated clearly for all potential applicants and trainees on the programme. The visitors therefore require the advertising materials (such as the website) and programme documentation (such as the student handbook) to be revised to include this information to ensure that applicants and trainees have all the information they need to make an informed choice on whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

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 revisit programme documentation to clearly articulate the procedures for lines of responsibility for all persons involved in the placement experience for the trainees on this programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included placement information which outlined the roles and responsibilities of the clinical supervisors at placement when the clinical supervisor was registered with the HPC. It was unclear as to who took responsibility for the trainee at placement when this clinical supervisor was not registered with the HPC.

Discussions at the visit clarified that in these instances an HPC registered 'Coordinating supervisor' would be present and they would have overall

responsibility for the trainee. The clinical supervisor directly working with the trainee would be known as the 'Associate coordinator' and the coordinating supervisor and associate coordinator would work together to ensure the trainee is managing the placement appropriately.

The visitors were satisfied with the arrangements for a coordinating supervisor who would be HPC registered to be present and accountable for all trainees however require information about these arrangements to be clearly articulated for trainees in the programme documentation (such as the placement handbook). The visitors therefore require revised programme documentation that clearly articulates the procedures for lines of responsibility for all persons involved in the placement experience for the trainees on this programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should monitor how the programme team continue to cover the roles and responsibilities of the vacant position while there is an empty post in the programme team.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation there is a vacant position on the team which is yet to be filled. The visitors were satisfied there was an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. However, the visitors recommend the programme team monitor the covering of the roles and responsibilities of the vacant position to ensure there is no adverse effect to the delivery of the programme while a new member of staff is sourced.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend that the education provider considers further communication and signposting of information on the student complaints process for trainees.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions at the visit it was clear that there was a student complaints process. At the visit the programme team explained that this information was conveyed to the students at induction and through the student handbook. Discussions with the students indicated they were not fully aware of the process or where to access this information although they felt confident they could find the information if they looked for it. The visitors therefore wish to recommend that the education provider considers further communication and signposting of information on the student complaints process throughout the duration of the programme alongside the initial information given at induction.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should monitor how information regarding the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics is disseminated.

Reason: The documentation provided and discussions at the visit indicated the programme team were fully aware of the need to ensure the trainees were aware of the HPC and the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors were satisfied with the level of communication that currently takes place but are aware the profession is ever-changing and that as a result the programme will always be developing and changing also. The visitors wish to highlight to the programme team that they should always be looking at

how they communicate information regarding the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics to ensure trainees are fully aware of the implications of the HPC and the HPC standards of conduct performance and ethics.

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

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to look at how they develop working relationships with newly recruited placement providers.

Reason: The education provider has recently entered into an agreement with new placement providers to provide additional placements for their trainees. Discussions at the visit indicated the placements with which long standing working relationships existed, were fully prepared for working with trainees from this programme and were fully engaged with the development and collaboration of the programme. The newer placement providers however, did not feel as connected and engaged in the programme. There were some issues highlighted regarding information about meetings and trainee contracts which was not being disseminated as thoroughly as it could have been. The visitors were aware that at the time of the visit the new placement providers had been working with the programme for only 3 months and so some 'teething problems' were to be expected. The visitors also wanted to highlight that because the placements are new to the programme they may need extra support and help until they are fully aware of all the intricacies of the programme and more confident with knowing the workings of the programme. The visitors wish to recommend that the programme team look at how they communicate with the new placement providers to ensure the appropriate support is given and the placement is able to communicate problems to the education provider which are then acted upon.

Harry Brick
Stephen Davies

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Queen's University of Belfast
Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsych)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Clinical psychologist
Date of visit	10 – 11 February 2011

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 April 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 31 March 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 15 April 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 12 May 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	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Stephen Davies (Clinical psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	13
Initial approval	1 January 1994
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Anne Fenton (Queen's University of Belfast)
Secretary	Caroline Sinclair (Queen's University of Belfast)
Members of the joint panel	Molly Ross (British Psychological Society) Isabel Hargeaves (British Psychological Society) Mary O'Reilly (British Psychological Society) Andrew Thompson (British Psychological Society) Mahbub Khan (British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants are made aware of any likely additional costs associated with the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that students are required to have professional liability insurance. The visitors note that this is clearly stated within the programme documentation however the visitors were unable to determine how potential applicants are informed about the associated costs of this requirement. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clearly highlight the potential additional costs associated with professional liability insurance to ensure that applicants can make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must re-visit all programme documentation including advertising materials to clearly state the potential distances required to travel when attending placements.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team the visitors clarified when and where students' practice placements would take place. However, when reviewing the documentation the visitors articulated that there was not a great deal of detail regarding the location of the practice placement elements of the programme. This lack of information about likely placement locations and subsequent travel costs may mean that students can not make an informed decision about whether to take up a place on the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation, including advertising material, to clearly highlight to potential applicants the geographical area in which placements will be based to make sure that this standard can be met.

2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the arrangements that are in place for criminal conviction checks and highlight any associated costs.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation states that students are responsible for funding an initial criminal conviction check when they take up an offer of a place on the programme. After discussion with the senior management team and the programme team however, the visitors were given contradictory accounts of the process and the funding arrangements for criminal

conviction checks. The visitors therefore require clarification of the arrangements that are in place for criminal conviction checks and clarification of how long the initial criminal conviction check lasts once it has been processed. The visitors finally seek clarification of the process and funding arrangements in place for criminal conviction checks for non-NHS practice placements. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify the system that is in place for obtaining students' informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation and through meetings with the programme team that students are asked to sign a consent form before they participate as service users in practical teaching. The visitors also noted that students sign this form before they start the programme as part of the contract of employment. From discussion with the students, however, some of them had little or no awareness of the system the education provider uses for gaining their informed consent. Some students highlighted the fact that it was not until they progressed later into the programme that they had the confidence to discuss with the programme team any issues that they might have participating as a service user in practical teaching. The visitors note that the student consent form was part of the contract of employment. The visitors articulated that opting out of this consent form would mean that a student would not be able to take up a place on the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clarify the arrangements that are in place for gaining students' informed consent. They also require clarification of how students are informed of their right to confidentiality and informed of their right to withdraw from any such activities which require them to participate as service users. This is to ensure that appropriate protocols are used to obtain students' consent and that this standard continues to be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of the policies and processes that are used for approving new placements.

Reason: From the documents submitted and discussions with the programme team the visitors were not able to clearly define the policies and processes that the education provider uses to approve new placements. The visitors noted that the education provider has a thorough and effective system in place for the monitoring of placements via the audit tool and tutor meetings. However, the visitors require further information about how the education provider approves placements before they are used. The visitors need further evidence to be confident that new placements are not approved retrospectively and that students will not go to a new placement setting before it has been audited. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly demonstrate that all practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training before they supervise students.

Reason: The visitors note that the education provider offers practice placement educator training to practice placement educators. The visitors also noted that the practice placement educators that are currently being utilised by the education provider are experienced and have received practice placement educator training. However, through discussions with the programme team and practice placement educators it is evident that the training is not mandatory. The visitors therefore require clarification of the arrangements that are in place to ensure that new practice placement educators are appropriately trained. This is to ensure that students will be supervised by practice placement educators that have received appropriate training and that this standard continues to be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation to provide evidence of the mechanism in place to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to evidence a mechanism that the education provider uses to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered. The visitors note that this would normally be evidenced within the placement audit. The visitors also noted from discussions with the programme team that some practice placement educators may not be HPC registered. If the education provider chooses to use practice placement educators who are not registered with HPC, then the visitors require evidence outlining the mechanisms the education provider uses to ensure these practice placement educators are appropriately experienced, qualified and have training relevant to the practice placement. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of a mechanism that ensures both consistency and equity for student academic progression.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with students and the programme team the visitors noted a disparity between the times different students had to wait to receive feedback from the programme team for an assessed piece of work. The visitors noted that students received feedback in batches and not consistently as a cohort. The visitors noted that this did not offer students' equity in terms of their academic progression as some students would be able to act on feedback earlier than others when tackling the next piece of assessment. The visitors require further evidence of a mechanism

that ensures consistency and equity in the time it takes for students to receive feedback from an assessed piece of work.

Recommendation

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 should consider clearly specifying that the MPhil exit award does not lead to eligibility to apply to the Register.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors were happy that the requirements of the HPC relating to the title of the step-off or exit awards were being met. The visitors did however feel that students would benefit from a statement that clearly outlines that the alternative MPhil award does not confer eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

Ruth Baker
Stephen Davies

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Wales Institute, Cardiff
Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Practitioner Forensic Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Forensic psychologist
Date of visit	1 – 2 February 2011

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	11

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Forensic 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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 March 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 12 May 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 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 it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme. The visit also considered the 'Post Graduate Certificate in Practitioner Health Psychology' 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 all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Emcee Chekwas (Forensic psychologist) George Delafield (Forensic and Occupational psychologist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort shared with the 'Post Graduate Certificate in Practitioner Health Psychology' programme once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2011
Chair	Peter Treadwell (University of Wales Institute, Cardiff)
Secretary	Chris George ((University of Wales Institute, Cardiff)
Members of the joint panel	Paul Bennett (External Panel Member) Ruth Matheson (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"/>
Miscellaneous programme information as provided by education provider	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

The HPC met with past and current students from the MSc Forensic Psychology and MSc Health Psychology programmes, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for 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 approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The programme team must revise the advertising materials and joining instructions for this programme to include information regarding expected programme costs and accreditation for prior (experiential) learning (APEL) policies for the programme.

Reason: The advertising materials and joining instructions for the programme provided prior to the visit did not include APEL policies or give details of expected programme costs for students.

In discussion with the programme team it was apparent that there was additional information that potential applicants were not informed of which could impact on their decision whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme or not. It was discussed with the programme team that the programme does not use APEL policies. A students' past learning is looked at to ensure they meet the criteria for entry to the programme only; they can not use prior learning to exempt themselves from any part of the programme content. The expectations of programme costs were also discussed, it was not expected that the student buys all text books (this is left to students discretion), however transport to and from placements and arranging overnight stays at placements further afield was expected. The bench fee for this programme had not yet been calculated and so it was not possible to include this in the advertising materials provided prior to the visit.

The visitors considered information about APEL, expected costs, transport and accommodation and bench fees to be important for any potential applicant looking to study on this programme. The visitors therefore require revised advertising materials and joining information to clearly articulate this information for potential applicants.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The programme team must provide details of the committee structures in place for this programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit gave details of the committees in place for the currently running MSc Forensic Psychology programmes. Discussions at the visit with the programme team indicated they had not yet formally planned the layout of the committees for this programme but they anticipated the programme committees running similarly to, or with, the MSc Forensic Psychology programmes. The visitors consider effective committees to be central to the management and maintenance of the programme and allow transparent auditing for monitoring and evaluating the programme. In order to be sure the programme will be effectively managed the visitors require details of all

committees planned for this programme including their interactions (with each other and the programme), the expected attendees, their role and remit (terms of reference) and the frequency of which they are held.

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

Condition: The programme team must clearly articulate the alternative options for when students decide to 'opt out' of giving consent to participating in role plays or interaction.

Reason: The documentation submitted for this programme included a consent form which needed to be signed by the student for when they were required to participate in role-play or interaction ("sharing of experiences, discussion, observation and feedback" (Document 8: E Role Play and Shared Learning Consent Form)) as the programme demanded. The advert for the programme stated that if a student would be unable to consent to such activities the programme team would work together to "achieve a suitable alternative experience" (Document 8: F Advert for Forensic). Discussion with the programme team disclosed that the alternative to meeting the learning outcomes through role-play or interaction would be to meet them in real service user situations at placement. The visitors considered this to be pertinent information for the students and therefore require the programme team to revise the adverts and consent forms to clearly articulate the alternative options available for when students decide to 'opt out' of giving consent to the use of role plays and interaction.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further documentation regarding the approval and monitoring of all placements and revised programme documentation that clearly articulates placement approval and monitoring processes for all parties involved.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated to be eligible to enrol on the programme, students must have secured a practice placement (Programme Specification, p9). The documentation did not provide any evidence of how a placement is initially approved by the education provider. Discussions at the visit with the programme team indicated that a 'skills audit' would be carried out to assess the suitability of the placement before agreeing the placement would be used. The placement documentation (Placement Student Handbook and Placement Supervisors Handbook) did not mention the 'skills audit' or how it is used by the programme team with placement providers and students.

Programme documentation did not provide any details of how the placement would be monitored once the initial 'skills audit' had been undertaken. The programme team indicated that the monitoring of the placements would be undertaken at the regular meetings to be held throughout the placement (4 times a year). These regular meetings would be held between the student, the

placement supervisor and the academic supervisor and focus on the supervisory log which contained learning outcomes to be met by the student on placement. From documentation provided prior to the visit and discussions at the visit it was unclear whether separate ongoing monitoring of the placement environments occurred.

The visitors considered that if the 'skills audit' was used as discussed, it could be an effective method of initially approving placements. The visitors felt additionally it could be used as a way to continually monitor the placements (either alongside the regular meetings through placement or as a separate process carried out regularly) to ensure placement suitability is maintained and records of both the approval and monitoring of placement are held. The visitors considered information about the 'skills audit' to be necessary for the placement providers, students and programme team to understand its management and its function and therefore programme documentation should include information about the 'skills audit'.

Because the visitors have not seen the 'skills audit' that was discussed or information regarding its application, they require further information about the 'skills audit' used to ensure its appropriateness. The visitors also require evidence that a system for ongoing monitoring of placements will be established. Additionally the visitors require revised documentation that clearly articulates the use of the 'skills audit' and information of the placement approval and monitoring processes in place for all parties involved in placement.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further documentation regarding how they ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff is present at the practice placement setting and revised documentation that clearly articulates how suitability of placement staff is reviewed.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated to be eligible to enrol on the programme, students must have secured a practice placement (Programme Specification, p9). The documentation did not provide any evidence of how the programme team ensure the placement has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. Discussions at the visit with the programme team indicated that a 'skills audit' would be carried out to assess the suitability of the placement before agreeing the placement would be used, including the suitability of the staff present at the placement by assessing their training needs. The placement documentation (Placement Student Handbook and Placement Supervisors Handbook) did not mention the 'skills audit' or how it is used by the programme team with placement providers and students.

The visitors considered that if the 'skills audit' was used as discussed, it could be an effective method of initially approving placements and ensuring the qualifications and experience of staff at placement. The visitors felt additionally it could be used as a way to continually monitor the placements to ensure that if staff changes occur there would be no impact upon the student's learning. The visitors considered information about the 'skills audit' to be necessary for the

placement providers, students and programme team to understand its management and its function and therefore programme documentation should include information about the 'skills audit'.

Because the visitors have not seen the 'skills audit' that was discussed or information regarding its application, they require further information about the 'skills audit' used to ensure its appropriateness. The visitors also require evidence that the programme team are ensuring there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting. Additionally the visitors require revised documentation that clearly articulates how placement staff are reviewed using the 'skills audit' for all parties involved in placement.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further documentation regarding how they ensure practice placement clinical supervisors have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience and revised documentation that clearly articulates how suitability of placement staff is reviewed.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated to be eligible to enrol on the programme, students must have secured a practice placement (Programme Specification, p9). The documentation did not provide any evidence of how the programme team ensure the practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. Discussions at the visit with the programme team indicated that a 'skills audit' would be carried out to assess the suitability of the placement before agreeing the placement would be used, including suitability of the staff present at the placement by looking at their training needs. The placement documentation (Placement Student Handbook and Placement Supervisors Handbook) did not mention the 'skills audit' or how it is used by the programme team with placement providers and students.

The visitors considered that if the 'skills audit' was used as discussed, it could be an effective method of initially approving placements and ensuring the knowledge, skills and experience of staff at placement. The visitors felt additionally it could be used as a way to continually monitor the placements to ensure that if staff changes occur there would be no impact upon the student's learning. The visitors considered information about the 'skills audit' to be necessary for the placement providers, students and programme team to understand its management and its function and therefore programme documentation should include information about the 'skills audit'.

Because the visitors have not seen the 'skills audit' that was discussed or information regarding its application, they require further information about the 'skills audit' used to ensure its appropriateness. The visitors require evidence that the programme team are ensuring placement supervisors have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. Additionally the visitors require revised documentation that clearly articulates how placement staff are reviewed using the 'skills audit' for all parties involved in placement.

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

Condition: The programme team must ensure placement supervisors have undertaken mandatory initial training prior to working with students and ensure they will undertake refresher training as appropriate.

Reason: Documentation received prior to the visit stated that the placement supervisor would be offered “access to appropriate training (based on their qualifications and experience) for supervising forensic psychologists in training” (Placement Student Handbook, p3). The supervisors were invited to attend the programme introductory workshop (Workshop 1: Introduction to Certificate, assessment and case studies) which is the first workshop for students introducing them to the programme. There was no additional information regarding separate training for supervisors.

Discussions at the visit with the programme team confirmed that they offered training and the programme team expected mandatory attendance although they admitted this requirement was not clearly stated. Documentation provided and discussions with the programme team indicated there was no regular refresher training to be held for practice supervisors. The visitors considered training prior to taking students from the programme to be essential to ensure the student placement experience is appropriately managed by the placement supervisor and that they are trained appropriately for the role expected of them. The visitors also considered ongoing refresher training to be necessary in order to keep the placement supervisor informed as to updates and changes to the programme and to refresh their skills at working with trainees.

It is the programme teams’ responsibility to ensure appropriate training of some kind – either run by the education provider directly or run by external training bodies, has taken place and is monitored. Therefore the visitors require further documentation of how the programme team plan to ensure placement supervisors have undertaken mandatory initial training prior to working with students and how they plan to ensure they will undertake refresher training as appropriate.

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 including further information about the application process for potential applicants in advertising materials.

Reason: The advertising materials provided prior to the visit contained a lot of programme specific information such as entry criteria, the structure of the programme and assessment details. There was discussion at the visit with the programme team regarding the admissions processes and information given in joining instructions (interviews, CRB checks, occupational health checks). With the understanding that the programme team would meet the condition placed against this standard the visitors felt happy with this standard being met however they felt that some additional information could be communicated earlier through programme advertising materials. In particular regarding the application interview processes for potential applicants so they are fully aware of all the steps in the application process rather than only once an application has been made and joining instructions have been sent.

3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Recommendation: The programme team may wish to consider revising their academic and pastoral student support system.

Reason: Documentation and discussions at the visit indicated each student would be allocated a member of staff as their tutor for both academic and pastoral problems. The visitors were happy that this standard was met with the academic and personal tutor being the same person however felt there was the possibility that students might not want to see the same person for both academic and personal concerns. The visitors suggest allocating students two tutors – one an academic tutor and one a personal tutor, further encouraging students to approach tutors with issues and concerns applicable to their roles. In this way the visitors feel the academic and support systems used by the programme would be better served to their purpose.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Recommendation: The programme team may wish to consider revising programme documentation when referencing the complaints procedures.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included detailed information about all of the complaints procedures in place (for both academic and non-academic concerns). The visitors were happy that this standard was met

from this information provided. Discussions with the students from the MSc Forensic Psychology programme indicated there was some confusion between the academic complaints and the non-academic complaints processes. For this new programme the visitors recommend the programme team revisit the documentation to make it clearer as to the types of concerns that feed into the different complaints procedures (fitness to practice, appeals process, student complaints). The visitors feel this clarity could be beneficial to students on the programme.

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

Recommendation: The programme team may wish to consider implementing a formal signed agreement between the education provider and placement provider(s).

Reason: Currently the placements for this programme are arranged through contact from members of the programme team. The practice portfolio is the signed document between the student, placement supervisor and academic supervisor to look at how the competencies are being met on placement. There is no other signed agreement between placement providers and the education provider. The visitors recommend the programme team investigate implementing a formal, signed agreement for the practice placements, and the education provider, which clearly states the expectation of the roles of both parties. This would limit confusion regarding the expectation of each role involved in placement and additionally act as a safeguard against the placement provider or education provider being able to suddenly withdraw from offering the placement or the student.

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

Recommendation: The programme team could consider reviewing the MSc Forensic Psychology programme documentation to ensure it is clearly articulated that the programme does not lead to eligibility to apply for HPC registration.

Reason: The documentation for this programme clearly articulates that only those who successfully complete the programme will be granted the final award and eligibility to apply for HPC registration. The visitors are aware that the entry requirements for this programme state an applicant must have completed the education providers' MSc Forensic Psychology programme or another British Psychological Society accredited MSc programme. The visitors wish to recommend the programme team ensure it is clearly articulated that the education providers' MSc Forensic Psychology programme alone will not grant eligibility to apply for HPC Registration.

Emcee Chekwas
George Delafield

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Wales Institute, Cardiff
Programme name	Post Graduate Certificate in Practitioner Health Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Health psychologist
Date of visit	1 – 2 February 2011

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	14

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 March 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 12 May 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 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 it was a new programme which was seeking HPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme. The visit also considered the 'Post Graduate Diploma in Practitioner Forensic Psychology' 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 all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Ewan Gillon (Health and Counselling Psychologist) Peter Branston (Educational Psychologist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort shared with the 'Post Graduate Diploma in Forensic Psychology' programme once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2011
Chair	Peter Treadwell (University of Wales Institute, Cardiff)
Secretary	Chris George ((University of Wales Institute, Cardiff)
Members of the joint panel	Paul Bennett (External Panel Member) Ruth Matheson (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"/>
Miscellaneous programme information as provided by education provider	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

The HPC met with past and current students from the MSc Health Psychology and MSc Forensic Psychology programmes, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for 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 approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The programme team must revise the advertising materials and joining instructions for this programme to include information regarding expected programme costs and accreditation for prior (experiential) learning (APEL) policies for the programme.

Reason: The advertising materials and joining instructions for the programme provided prior to the visit did not include APEL policies or give details of expected programme costs for students.

In discussion with the programme team it was apparent that there was additional information that potential applicants were not informed of which could impact on their decision whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme or not. It was discussed with the programme team that the programme does not use APEL policies. A students' past learning is looked at to ensure they meet the criteria for entry to the programme only; they can not use prior learning to exempt themselves from any part of the programme content. The expectations of programme costs were also discussed, it was not expected that the student buys all text books (this is left to students discretion), however transport to and from placements and arranging overnight stays at placements further afield was expected. The bench fee for this programme had not yet been calculated and so it was not possible to include this in the advertising materials provided prior to the visit.

The visitors considered information about APEL, expected costs, transport and accommodation and bench fees to be important for any potential applicant looking to study on this programme. The visitors therefore require revised advertising materials and joining information to clearly articulate this information for potential applicants.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide details of contingency plans in place for the circumstance that the programme needs to be withdrawn.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated the education provider had been planning for this programme for some time; the department has been intending to grow and develop as detailed in the Programme Justification document. Discussions at the visit indicated they were hopeful for this programme and were also aware that they needed viable numbers of students in order for it to run; research undertaken indicated there would be enough persons interested in the programme to ensure its viability for the first cohort. The visitors are aware that in the present economical climate it may be

difficult to find students or placements for subsequent cohorts and so may be necessary for the education provider to reconsider running this programme. Discussions with the programme team indicated they had had preliminary discussions about contingency plans but not formalised any arrangements. The visitors are concerned that if the programme ever needs to be withdrawn, students on the programme may be left uncatered for and without support in place to continue their studies. The visitors therefore require details of contingency plans in place to ensure the programme team have considered the implications for students on the programme if they ever needed to manage such an occurrence as programme withdrawal.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The programme team must provide details of the committee structures in place for this programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit gave details of the committees in place for the currently running MSc Health Psychology programmes. Discussions at the visit with the programme team indicated they had not yet formally planned the layout of the committees for this programme but they anticipated the programme committees running similarly to, or with, the MSc Health Psychology programmes. The visitors consider effective committees to be central to the management and maintenance of the programme and allow transparent auditing for monitoring and evaluating the programme. In order to be sure the programme will be effectively managed the visitors require details of all committees planned for this programme including their interactions (with each other and the programme), the expected attendees, their role and remit (terms of reference) and the frequency of which they are held.

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

Condition: The programme team must clearly articulate the alternative options for when students decide to 'opt out' of giving consent to participating in role plays or interaction.

Reason: The documentation submitted for this programme included a consent form which needed to be signed by the student for when they were required to participate in role-play or interaction ("sharing of experiences, discussion, observation and feedback" (Document 8: E Role Play and Shared Learning Consent Form)) as the programme demanded. The advert for the programme stated that if a student would be unable to consent to such activities the programme team would work together to "achieve a suitable alternative experience" (Document 8: G Advert for Health). Discussion with the programme team disclosed that the alternative to meeting the learning outcomes through role-play or interaction would be to meet them in real service user situations at placement. The visitors considered this to be pertinent information for the students and therefore require the programme team to revise the adverts and consent forms to clearly articulate the alternative options available for when

students decide to 'opt out' of giving consent to the use of role plays and interaction.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further documentation regarding the approval and monitoring of all placements and revised programme documentation that clearly articulates placement approval and monitoring processes for all parties involved.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated to be eligible to enrol on the programme, students must have secured a practice placement (Programme Specification, p9). The documentation did not provide any evidence of how a placement is initially approved by the education provider. Discussions at the visit with the programme team indicated that a 'skills audit' would be carried out to assess the suitability of the placement before agreeing the placement would be used. The placement documentation (Placement Student Handbook and Placement Supervisors Handbook) did not mention the 'skills audit' or how it is used by the programme team with placement providers and students.

Programme documentation did not provide any details of how the placement would be monitored once the initial 'skills audit' had been undertaken. The programme team indicated that the monitoring of the placements would be undertaken at the regular meetings to be held throughout the placement (4 times a year). These regular meetings would be held between the student, the placement supervisor and the academic supervisor and focus on the supervisory log which contained learning outcomes to be met by the student on placement. From documentation provided prior to the visit and discussions at the visit it was unclear whether separate ongoing monitoring of the placement environments occurred.

The visitors considered that if the 'skills audit' was used as discussed, it could be an effective method of initially approving placements. The visitors felt additionally it could be used as a way to continually monitor the placements (either alongside the regular meetings through placement or as a separate process carried out regularly) to ensure placement suitability is maintained and records of both the approval and monitoring of placement are held. The visitors considered information about the 'skills audit' to be necessary for the placement providers, students and programme team to understand its management and its function and therefore programme documentation should include information about the 'skills audit'.

Because the visitors have not seen the 'skills audit' that was discussed or information regarding its application, they require further information about the 'skills audit' used to ensure its appropriateness. The visitors also require evidence that a system for ongoing monitoring of placements will be established. Additionally the visitors require revised documentation that clearly articulates the use of the 'skills audit' and information of the placement approval and monitoring processes in place for all parties involved in placement.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further documentation regarding how they ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff is present at the practice placement setting and revised documentation that clearly articulates how suitability of placement staff is reviewed.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated to be eligible to enrol on the programme, students must have secured a practice placement (Programme Specification, p9). The documentation did not provide any evidence of how the programme team ensure the placement has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. Discussions at the visit with the programme team indicated that a 'skills audit' would be carried out to assess the suitability of the placement before agreeing the placement would be used, including the suitability of the staff present at the placement by assessing their training needs. The placement documentation (Placement Student Handbook and Placement Supervisors Handbook) did not mention the 'skills audit' or how it is used by the programme team with placement providers and students.

The visitors considered that if the 'skills audit' was used as discussed, it could be an effective method of initially approving placements and ensuring the qualifications and experience of staff at placement. The visitors felt additionally it could be used as a way to continually monitor the placements to ensure that if staff changes occur there would be no impact upon the student's learning. The visitors considered information about the 'skills audit' to be necessary for the placement providers, students and programme team to understand its management and its function and therefore programme documentation should include information about the 'skills audit'.

Because the visitors have not seen the 'skills audit' that was discussed or information regarding its application, they require further information about the 'skills audit' used to ensure its appropriateness. The visitors also require evidence that the programme team are ensuring there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting. Additionally the visitors require revised documentation that clearly articulates how placement staff are reviewed using the 'skills audit' for all parties involved in placement.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further documentation regarding how they ensure practice placement clinical supervisors have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience and revised documentation that clearly articulates how suitability of placement staff is reviewed.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated to be eligible to enrol on the programme, students must have secured a practice placement

(Programme Specification, p9). The documentation did not provide any evidence of how the programme team ensure the practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. Discussions at the visit with the programme team indicated that a 'skills audit' would be carried out to assess the suitability of the placement before agreeing the placement would be used, including suitability of the staff present at the placement by looking at their training needs. The placement documentation (Placement Student Handbook and Placement Supervisors Handbook) did not mention the 'skills audit' or how it is used by the programme team with placement providers and students.

The visitors considered that if the 'skills audit' was used as discussed, it could be an effective method of initially approving placements and ensuring the knowledge, skills and experience of staff at placement. The visitors felt additionally it could be used as a way to continually monitor the placements to ensure that if staff changes occur there would be no impact upon the student's learning. The visitors considered information about the 'skills audit' to be necessary for the placement providers, students and programme team to understand its management and its function and therefore programme documentation should include information about the 'skills audit'.

Because the visitors have not seen the 'skills audit' that was discussed or information regarding its application, they require further information about the 'skills audit' used to ensure its appropriateness. The visitors require evidence that the programme team are ensuring placement supervisors have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. Additionally the visitors require revised documentation that clearly articulates how placement staff are reviewed using the 'skills audit' for all parties involved in placement.

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

Condition: The programme team must ensure placement supervisors have undertaken mandatory initial training prior to working with students and ensure they will undertake refresher training as appropriate.

Reason: Documentation received prior to the visit stated that the placement supervisor would be offered "access to appropriate training (based on their qualifications and experience) for supervising trainee health psychologists" (Placement Student Handbook, p3). The supervisors were invited to attend the programme introductory workshop (Workshop 1: Introduction to Certificate and assessment & Professional Practice) which is the first workshop for students introducing them to the programme. There was no additional information regarding separate training for supervisors.

Discussions at the visit with the programme team confirmed that they offered training and the programme team expected mandatory attendance although they admitted this requirement was not clearly stated. Documentation provided and discussions with the programme team indicated there was no regular refresher training to be held for practice supervisors. The visitors considered training prior to taking students from the programme to be essential to ensure the student placement experience is appropriately managed by the placement supervisor

and that they are trained appropriately for the role expected of them. The visitors also considered ongoing refresher training to be necessary in order to keep the placement supervisor informed as to updates and changes to the programme and to refresh their skills at working with trainees.

It is the programme teams' responsibility to ensure appropriate training of some kind – either run by the education provider directly or run by external training bodies, has taken place and is monitored. Therefore the visitors require further documentation of how the programme team plan to ensure placement supervisors have undertaken mandatory initial training prior to working with students and how they plan to ensure they will undertake refresher training as appropriate.

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

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

Condition: The programme team must clearly identify how consistent standards of assessment are maintained across placement supervisors.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included the Placement Supervisor Handbook gave information regarding the assessment of students at placement. The criterion for rating competencies is a score of 1 - 3. Training is offered to placement supervisors dependant on their qualifications and experience and they are invited to attend the programme introductory workshop (Workshop 1: Introduction to Certificate and assessment & Professional Practice), the first workshop for students introducing them to the programme. There was no additional information regarding separate training for placement supervisors looking at assessment. The Placement Supervisor handbook stated that there would be “moderation meetings” for all placement supervisors which would be held annually to review “a range of portfolios and develop their [placement supervisors] understanding of the assessment process” (Placement Supervisor Handbook p9). There was no additional information as to the format of these meetings, their content or the managing of attendance.

The visitors are concerned that without the assurance of being certain the placement supervisors are trained appropriately in how to formulate assessments of students competencies, the level of assessment undertaken across the placements may be varied in terms of consistent use of ratings. In order to be fully prepared to undertake the work with students, placement supervisors must be aware of the learning outcomes to be achieved, expectations of professional conduct and the assessment procedures and it is the programme team's responsibility to ensure placement supervisors are consistent in their use of the

rating of competencies across placements especially in regard to failing placements.

The visitors require evidence how the programme team ensures placement supervisors are fully prepared for placement and understand the learning outcomes to be achieved, expectations of professional conduct and assessment procedures and that consistent standards of assessment are maintained across placements.

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

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

Condition: The programme team must revise programme documentation to clearly articulate assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit cited the Programme Handbook, the Placement Student Handbook and the Placement Supervisor Handbooks as the main sources of information regarding assessment on placement (SETs mapping document, SET 5.11). There was a procedure detailed to contact the academic supervisor and programme director when it was found that the student was “not competent and is failing to develop towards [the] competency” (Placement Student Handbook, p5). The Programme Handbook indicated when a pass or a fail was awarded, “A fail will evidence that: a student has not demonstrated competency in one or more areas listed in appendix 2 [the supervisory log] and/or has failed on the performance items of the supervisory log.” The documentation did not state any other processes or procedures that came into play when placements were failing or failed. The documents stated that all the assessments needed to be passed in order to be awarded the final award, there was no mention of assessment in terms of the number of re-takes the student could have (Programme Handbook, p20).

Discussions with the programme team indicated that the academic supervisor and the placement supervisor would both be present at regular meetings to assess the supervisory log and to give ratings. It was discussed that if there was a disagreement over a rating between the academic supervisor, the placement supervisor or the student then additional processes would be initiated. An internal moderation and then an external moderation using external examiners would take place to identify the correct rating. The student then would have the option of appealing the decision. These arrangements were not described in the programme documentation. It was also discussed with the programme team that there was a designated amount of time in which the practice portfolio would need to be completed in, during this designated timeframe the student could continue

to work at meeting the competencies. If by the end of the timeframe the student had been unable to meet all competencies they would not be awarded the final award.

The visitors considered this information to be important for students to fully understand the implications and the procedures when placements are failed or if there are disagreements surrounding the assessment of placements. For clarity for students and placement supervisors the visitors require this information to be clearly articulated in the placement documentation.

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

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

Condition: The programme team must ensure there are clear mechanisms in place to deal with complaints at both the education provider and practice placement level and ensure the interactions of the complaints procedures at both levels are clearly articulated in placement documentation for students and placement supervisors.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit identified the education providers' fitness to practice policy which deals with issues arising from students' health and conduct in addition to how they meet the learning outcomes. Discussion at the visit with the programme team indicated that along with the education provider policies the students would be held liable by the policies at the practice placement. The visitors were concerned that if there were any complaints or grievances raised whilst the student was on placement (either by the student or by the clinical supervisor) it was not clear which policy would be used and how the policies would interact with each other if one or the other policies reached a resolution that differed from the other. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the programme team has ensured there are clear mechanisms in place to ensure complaints are dealt with effectively by both education provider and practice placement provider levels and that this information is clearly articulated for placement providers and students in placement documentation.

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 including further information about the application process for potential applicants in advertising materials.

Reason: The advertising materials provided prior to the visit contained a lot of programme specific information such as entry criteria, the structure of the programme and assessment details. There was discussion at the visit with the programme team regarding the admissions processes and information given in joining instructions (interviews, CRB checks, occupational health checks). With the understanding that the programme team would meet the condition placed against this standard the visitors felt happy with this standard being met however they felt that some additional information could be communicated earlier through programme advertising materials. In particular regarding the application interview processes for potential applicants so they are fully aware of all the steps in the application process rather than only once an application has been made and joining instructions have been sent.

3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Recommendation: The programme team may wish to consider revising their academic and pastoral student support system.

Reason: Documentation and discussions at the visit indicated each student would be allocated a member of staff as their tutor for both academic and pastoral problems. The visitors were happy that this standard was met with the academic and personal tutor being the same person however felt there was the possibility that students might not want to see the same person for both academic and personal concerns. The visitors suggest allocating students two tutors – one an academic tutor and one a personal tutor, further encouraging students to approach tutors with issues and concerns applicable to their roles. In this way the visitors feel the academic and support systems used by the programme would be better served to their purpose.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Recommendation: The programme team may wish to consider revising programme documentation when referencing the complaints procedures.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included detailed information about all of the complaints procedures in place (for both academic and non-academic concerns). The visitors were happy that this standard was met

from this information provided. Discussions with the students from the MSc Health Psychology programme indicated there was some confusion between the academic complaints and the non-academic complaints processes. For this new programme the visitors recommend the programme team revisit the documentation to make it clearer as to the types of concerns that feed into the different complaints procedures (fitness to practice, appeals process, student complaints). The visitors feel this clarity could be beneficial to students on the programme.

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

Recommendation: The programme team may wish to consider implementing a formal signed agreement between the education provider and placement provider(s).

Reason: Currently the placements for this programme are arranged through contact from members of the programme team. The practice portfolio is the signed document between the student, placement supervisor and academic supervisor to look at how the competencies are being met on placement. There is no other signed agreement between placement providers and the education provider. The visitors recommend the programme team investigate implementing a formal, signed agreement for the practice placements, and the education provider, which clearly states the expectation of the roles of both parties. This would limit confusion regarding the expectation of each role involved in placement and additionally act as a safeguard against the placement provider or education provider being able to suddenly withdraw from offering the placement or the student.

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

Recommendation: The programme team could consider reviewing the MSc Health Psychology programme documentation to ensure it is clearly articulated that the programme does not lead to eligibility to apply for HPC registration.

Reason: The documentation for this programme clearly articulates that only those who successfully complete the programme will be granted the final award and eligibility to apply for HPC registration. The visitors are aware that the entry requirements for this programme state an applicant must have completed the education providers' MSc Health Psychology programme or another British Psychological Society accredited MSc programme. The visitors wish to recommend the programme team ensure it is clearly articulated that the education providers' MSc Health Psychology programme alone will not grant eligibility to apply for HPC Registration.

Ewan Gillon
Peter Branston