

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	City University
Programme name	Doctorate in Health Psychology (Dpsych)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Health psychologist
Date of visit	7 – 8 June 2012

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	18

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 3 August 2012 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 23 August 2012. 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 November 2012. 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 14 February 2012.

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	Kathryn Thirlaway (Health psychologist) Rosemary Schaeffer (Occupational psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	David Christopher
Proposed cohort number	11 per cohort
First approved intake	January 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Louise Markes (City University)
Secretary	Erika Suchanova (City University)
Members of the joint panel	Liz Simpson (British Psychological Society) Caroline Limbert (British Psychological Society) Geraldine Kavanagh (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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Joint HPC approval and British Psychological Society accreditation event appendices	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review CVs for all relevant staff prior to the visit because the CVs of some staff were missing from the documentation provided. However, the education provider tabled the missing CVs at the visit.

The HPC did not review descriptions of the modules prior to the visit as this documentation does not exist. However, the education provider provided PowerPoint presentations for the workshops that students attend.

The HPC did not review a practice placement handbook prior to the visit as a separate practice placement handbook has not been produced. Information relating to placements is included in the programme handbook. However, the education provider is developing a handbook for practice placement educators and a draft version of this document was made available at the visit.

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 visitors were able to talk to one practice placement provider whose organisation had provided a new placement for a student within the last two

months. Due to late withdrawals the visitors did not meet any practice placement educators.

Due to illness and late withdrawals the visitors met a former student who had completed the programme in 2009. However, the education provider organised a Skype video-conference, which allowed the visitors to talk to two current students.

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 36 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 21 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.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate and is reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HPC.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider prior to the visit did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. One of the programme documents 'Professional Doctoral Training in Health Psychology' stated that the programme was 'recognised' by the HPC. The HPC 'approves' programmes. The programme handbook included reference to HPC codes of conduct. The HPC publishes standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors require the education provider to revise all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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

Condition: The education provider must identify clear health requirements in the information it makes available to applicants and set out the process for dealing with any health issues that are declared.

Reason: The SETs mapping document provided by the education provider included no evidence against this standard. In advance of the visit, clarification was sought from the education provider. The response was that the programme did not have any health checks as part of its admissions process because most students did not work in clinical settings. In discussions with the programme team, the education provider confirmed this position. The visitors were unsure how the education provider ensured that it had taken all reasonable steps to identify any health issues that could affect a student's ability to undertake the programme safely and effectively, or had made any reasonable adjustments that might be required by a new student. The visitors therefore require the education provider to identify clear health requirements in the information it makes available to applicants and set out the process for dealing with any health issues that are declared.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included a department plan and programme team plan. However, references to the programme in the department plan were difficult to identify and consequently the visitors were unable to determine the level of support for the programme. In discussions, the education provider's senior managers confirmed that the programme had a secure place in the education provider's business plan and referred to a strategic plan, which demonstrated the importance attached to the programme. However, the visitors were not provided with a copy of this strategic plan. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide a copy of this strategic plan, so they can be assured that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about the student complaints process and how students are informed about this process.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit indicated that the evidence for this standard was included in the programme handbook. The visitors noted that the handbook included a link to the complaints process, but there was no information in the handbook itself about the process. The visitors were also unclear how students were informed about the process. In discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that there was an institution-wide complaints process. However, the visitors were not provided with a copy of this process. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence about the student complaints process and clarification of how students are informed about this process to ensure 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 programme documentation must be revised to clearly articulate the process for obtaining student consent to participate in teaching and learning activities, including the procedures when consent is withheld.

Reason: The SETs mapping document submitted prior to the visit included no evidence for this standard. In advance of the visit, clarification was sought from the education provider. The response was that students do not participate as service users in practical teaching. However, consideration of the programme specification indicated that role-playing was a key element of the workshops offered as part of the programme. This was confirmed by the students, although they were not aware of any formal process for obtaining their consent to participate in such activities. The programme team explained that students were expected to participate in all workshops, although it was made clear to them that they could opt out of participation in any role-playing, which formed part of these workshops. However, the visitors noted that there was no formal protocol for seeking student consent to participate, or to indicate what would happen if consent was withheld. The visitors therefore require the education provider to articulate clearly the process by which consent for participation in such teaching and learning activities is obtained and how cases where consent is withheld are handled.

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

Condition: The programme documentation must be revised to articulate clearly the process for dealing with prolonged absences from practice placements.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit indicated that the evidence for this standard was included in the programme handbook. The visitors noted that the handbook made clear that attendance at workshops was mandatory and would be monitored. Discussions with students confirmed that this was the case. The handbook also indicated that students were required to inform their practice placement educator (referred to as a workplace supervisor by the education provider) of any periods of sickness longer than two weeks that prevented them from engaging in the supervised practice. However, it was unclear how the education provider would be informed of such cases and what steps might be taken to ensure that a student addressed any teaching and learning opportunities that had been missed. The practice placement provider was unaware of a formal process, but confirmed that if there was prolonged absence guidance would be sought from the education provider. The visitors noted that the education provider was developing a handbook for practice placement educators and welcomed this as a way of improving the information provided about the education provider's requirements. However, in the absence of any current guidance on this area it was unclear to the visitors how such absences would be handled and whether absenteeism would be dealt with consistently. The visitors therefore require the education provider to articulate clearly in its documentation the process for dealing with prolonged absences from practice placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide documentation setting out the procedures for identifying and addressing concerns about students' profession-related conduct and how these procedures will be communicated to students and practice placement educators.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit indicated that evidence for this standard was included in the programme handbook. However, the reference given related to progression and an annual review and was not clearly related to students' profession-related conduct. Discussions with the practice placement provider indicated that, if there were any concerns about students' profession-related conduct, the education provider would be contacted for guidance. Students indicated that they were provided with information about the standards of conduct expected of them, although they were not specific about how and when this was communicated. Discussions with the programme team revealed that the education provider had been using an institution-wide code of conduct to address such concerns. However, the education provider was developing a new process to deal with profession-related conduct following consultation with stakeholders and other education providers offering approved programmes. The visitors noted that a draft process was available, although this was not provided for consideration. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide

documentation setting out the procedures for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct and how these will be communicated to students and practice placement educators to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency for counselling psychologists.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit included a document showing how the programme's learning outcomes mapped onto the standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors noted that this document provided evidence that a number of the SOPs were addressed by the programme's learning outcomes. However, it was not evident that all the SOPs were addressed. The visitors noted that the education provider did not conduct any further detailed mapping to show how the programme's learning outcomes mapped onto specific teaching and learning opportunities and demonstrated how all the SOPs were met. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme's learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet all SOPs to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The programme documentation must be revised to articulate clearly the process for approving and monitoring practice placements to ensure that they provide a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit indicated that the evidence for this standard was included in the programme handbook and supported by visits to practice placements. The programme handbook included general information about practice placements and the education provider's requirements, including a document 'Safety Procedure No 13: work Placements for Students'. In addition, practice placement educators were sent a questionnaire, which included questions relating to health and safety issues and were asked to provide a copy of their organisation's health and safety policy. The practice placement provider stated that there was ongoing communication with the education provider about placements. The students indicated that work-based risk assessments had been completed by their employers. However, although the education provider had undertaken a risk assessment of one of the placements, it was not evident that this had not been done for the other student's placement, which had commenced in October 2011.

The documentation provided included some inconsistencies about when a first visit to a placement occurred. The programme handbook indicated that this would be within four to six months, although another document 'Doctorate in Health Psychology at City University' indicated that a visit would take place within three to four months. Discussions with the programme team revealed that the education provider was aware of the need to develop its arrangements for

interacting with practice placement providers and educators and had recently appointed a new member of staff to lead in this area. A handbook for practice placement educators was also being developed. The programme team stated that the intention was to visit placements as soon as possible, but they were sensitive to the wishes of students, some of whom did not wish a visit to be conducted in the first few months on the programme. The education provider was keen to ensure that all students were educated in a safe environment and maintained contact to ensure that this was the case. The visitors noted that if, for example, a student was working with difficult patients or undertaking lone work, the placement provider was expected to ensure that this was conducted safely. The visitors remained unclear about the process by which the education provider ensured that placements provided a safe and supportive environment. In order to be reassured that this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to articulate clearly the processes for approving and monitoring placements to ensure that they provide a safe and supportive environment.

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

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

Reason: In advance of the visit the education provider confirmed that it did not have a separate practice placement handbook for students. The documentation provided prior to the visit indicated that the evidence for this standard was included in the programme handbook. The programme handbook included information about practice placements and the education provider's requirements relating to having a practice placement contact, job description and the development of a supervision plan, which sets out how a student will gain the required experience. As already noted in the condition relating to SET 5.3, the visitors were informed that the relationship with practice placement providers and educators was an area that the education provider wished to develop. Accordingly, a new member of staff responsible for practice placements had been appointed and a practice placement handbook for placement educators was being developed. The visitors welcomed the appointment of a new member of staff to lead this work and the decision to develop a handbook for practice placement educators.

Although the programme handbook and draft practice placement educators handbook provided some useful information, the visitors found it difficult to understand the education provider's arrangements for approving and monitoring placements. Much of the information relating to placements was spread across the documents provided and it was difficult to gain a coherent understanding of the processes involved. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clearly articulate its process for approving and monitoring placements to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The programme documentation must be revised to articulate clearly the requirement for practice placement providers to have equality and diversity policies and to set out the steps taken to ensure that these policies are implemented and monitored within practice placements.

Reason: The SETs mapping document provided prior to the visit indicated that the evidence for this standard was included in the programme handbook and supported by practice placement visits. However, it was not clear to the visitors that this documentation was relevant to this standard. In discussions with the programme team it was suggested that questionnaire sent to practice placement educators included a question about equality and diversity policies. However, on reviewing this questionnaire, the visitors could find no such question. It was therefore unclear to the visitors what steps were in place to ensure that practice placement providers had and implemented such policies. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clearly articulate the requirement for practice placement providers to have equality and diversity policies and the steps taken to ensure that these policies are implemented and monitored within practice placements.

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

Condition: The programme documentation must be revised to clearly articulate the criteria for practice placement educators, in terms of the required qualifications and experience, and the steps taken to check that these criteria are met.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included some inconsistencies in relation to the requirements to be a practice placement educator. The programme handbook stated that placement educators would ideally be a chartered psychologist but included no reference to HPC registration. However, other documentation suggested that placement educators would be HPC registered. The programme handbook also set out the roles and responsibilities of the practice placement educator, but did not indicate the criteria for becoming a placement educator. In discussions, the programme team explained the process for approving placements and the measures taken, including visitors, to monitor placements. However, it was unclear to visitors what steps were taken to ensure that placement educators had appropriate qualifications and experience. Discussions with students revealed that neither student was supervised by an HPC registered practice placement educator. The visitors therefore require the education provider to articulate clearly the criteria for practice placement educators, in terms of required qualifications and experience, and the processes for ensuring that these criteria are met.

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

Condition: The programme documentation must be revised to clearly articulate the criteria for practice placement educators, in terms of the required knowledge, skills and experience, and the steps taken to check that these criteria are met.

Reason: As noted in the condition against SET 5.6, the visitors were unclear about the steps taken to ensure that suitable practice placement educators were in place, including whether they had appropriate knowledge, skills and experience. To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to articulate clearly the criteria for placement supervisors, in terms of the required knowledge, skills and experience, and the steps taken to check that these criteria are met.

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

Condition: The education provider must put in place a process for providing practice placement educators with training about the requirements of the programme.

Reason: The SETs mapping document provided in advance of the visit included no evidence for this standard. Discussions with the programme team confirmed that there was no formal training, although there was frequent contact and discussion with colleagues from the practice placements. The visitors noted the intention, already referred to, to improve contacts with placement providers and educators and the development of a handbook for placement educators. However, in the absence of any formal training for placement educators, the visitors were unclear how the education provider ensured that placement educators understood the programme's requirements. The visitors therefore require the education provider to articulate clearly the arrangements that will be put in place to ensure that all practice placement educators are informed and kept up to date about the programme's requirements.

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

Condition: The education provider must articulate clearly in programme documentation the expectation that placement educators should be appropriately registered and, where this is not the case, the steps that will be taken to ensure that appropriate placement educators are in place.

Reason: As noted in the condition against SET 5.6, there was some inconsistency in the documentation as to whether placement educators were expected to be registered with the HPC. In discussions with students it was clear that neither were supervised by an HPC registered professional. In discussions, the programme team indicated that there were insufficient registered health psychologists to supervise all students, but that when approving a programme, they were concerned to ensure that placement educators were appropriately experienced. The visitors require the education provider to articulate clearly in programme documentation that placement educators should be appropriately registered and, where this is not possible, the steps that will be taken to ensure that appropriate placement educators are in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further documentary evidence about the current practice placement educators that are in place, including their registration status and, where they are not registered, details of their qualifications and experience.

Reason: As noted in conditions set against SETs 5.6 and 5.7, the visitors were concerned about the steps taken to ensure that appropriately registered, qualified and experienced placement educators were in place. The criteria for becoming a placement educator were unclear and the steps taken to check their appropriateness were not articulated clearly. The visitors could not be certain therefore that all students were supervised by placement educators with appropriate registration. To be assured that this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to provide further documentary information about the registration status of current placement educators and, where they are not registered, details of the qualifications and experience which make them suitable to undertake this role.

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

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further documentary evidence of the steps taken to ensure that placement educators are well prepared for students before they commence the programme.

Reason: As indicated in the condition set against SET 5.8, the visitors noted that there is currently no formal training offered to practice placement educators. Although the practice placement provider and programme team indicated that there was ongoing contact with placement educators, the visitors were unsure whether placement educators were appropriately prepared when students start the programme. The visitors noted that steps were being taken to improve links with placement providers and educators through the appointment of a new member of staff to lead in this area and the development of a handbook for placement educators. To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to provide further documentary evidence of the steps taken to prepare practice placement educators before students start the programme.

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

Condition: The programme documentation must be revised to articulate clearly the processes for making service users aware of the status of students and for obtaining their consent.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, no evidence was provided in relation to this standard. In discussions, students confirmed that they inform service users of their trainee status, but were unaware of any formal requirements or guidance from the programme. The programme team informed the visitors that students were advised to make service users aware of their status and to seek consent appropriately, but confirmed that there was no formal protocol. The visitors therefore require the education provider to articulate clearly the processes for making service users aware of the status of trainees and for obtaining their consent.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency for counselling psychologists.

Reason: In line with the visitors' concerns relating to SET 4.1, they noted that the mapping documentation provided prior to the visit did not clearly indicate how all students who successfully completed the programme demonstrated that they had met all the standards of proficiency. The visitors were therefore unable to be confident that this standard was met. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme's assessment strategy and design ensures that all students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency to ensure that this standard is met.

6.5 The assessment of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practice.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the role of practice placement educators in the assessment of students and how the measurement of student performance on placements ensures fitness to practise.

Reason: In documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that the programme handbook indicated that practice placement educators were responsible for providing feedback on a student's performance on certain areas of competence as requested by the student's academic supervisor and the programme leader. The visitors also noted that when a student submitted evidence for assessment they were required to submit a workplace contact report which the practice placement educator signed and confirmed that the student had, in their opinion, completed the work to a satisfactory professional standard. However, practice placement educators received no formal training so the visitors were unclear how the placement educators could make such judgements without detailed knowledge of the programme's learning outcomes or the standards to be applied.

In discussions, the programme team stated that the information provided by the practice placement educators was taken into account with the other evidence submitted for assessment, but that assessment was conducted by an internal and an external examiner. In response to a question about who assessed students' competence during placements, the programme team stated that this was conducted by the academic supervisors, but confirmed that there was no direct observation of students in practice, other than the observation of one teaching and training session delivered by the student. The visitors were therefore unclear how the education provider could ensure that the assessment arrangements in place for placements ensured fitness to practise. The visitors therefore require further information about the role of practice placement educators in the assessment of students and the steps taken to ensure that the measurement of student performance on placements ensures fitness to practise.

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

Condition: The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that the masters degree, postgraduate diploma and postgraduate certificate exit awards do not confer eligibility to apply for HPC registration.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit made no explicit reference to an aegrotat award. However, the programme specification indicated that students who failed the doctorate could be eligible to be awarded a masters degree, postgraduate diploma or a postgraduate certificate, depending on the number of credits achieved. This information was not included in the programme handbook or any other programme documentation. In discussions, the programme team stated students were informed that these awards did not confer eligibility to apply for HPC registration. However, the programme specification did not contain a clear statement to this effect, which could lead to a misunderstanding about the status of these exit awards. The visitors therefore require the education provider to include a clear statement in the programme documentation that the masters degree, postgraduate diploma and postgraduate certificate exit awards do not confer eligibility to apply for HPC registration to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The programme documentation must be revised to include a clear statement that at least one external advisor for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: Visitors noted that, as the programme came under the education provider's research degree regulations, the external examiner was called an external advisor. The programme handbook included reference to the role of the external advisor, but did not indicate the knowledge, skills or expertise required of those undertaking this role. The visitors were satisfied with the current external advisor, but were concerned that the requirements relating to external advisors

were not set out in the programme documentation. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the programme documentation to include a clear statement that at least one external advisor for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register (health psychologist), unless other arrangements are agreed, to demonstrate that this standard is met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should considering reviewing the information conveyed to potential applications about the requirements for a good command of reading, writing and Spoken English to ensure that they are consistent.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation included requirements in relation to competency in English. However, there was some inconsistency in the communication of these requirements to applicants. The visitors suggested that it would be helpful to potential applicants for whom English was not the first language if the information about the levels required in the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) requirements were stated consistently across the programme documentation.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how data collected about applicants and students can be used to inform future recruitment strategies.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that this standard is met. The visitors noted that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in place and collects data in relation to applicants and students. However, the visitors would like to encourage the education provider to give further consideration to this data in order to determine whether it can identify any trends or information that could be used to inform future recruitment strategies.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider making explicit in the programme documentation the students' entitlement to a minimum of 10 supervisory meetings each year with their academic supervisor.

Reason: The visitors noted the supervisory arrangements that were in place and the roles and responsibilities as set out in the programme handbook. Students were very positive about the level of supervision and support provided by academic supervisors. In discussions, the programme team confirmed that each student was entitled to a minimum of 10 supervisory meetings with their academic supervisor each year. This information was not included in the handbook and the visitors suggested that the education provider should consider including it in the programme documentation so that students were aware of this entitlement.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to review and develop its collaborative arrangements with practice placement providers to ensure that collaboration is effective.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider had identified links with practice placement providers and educators as an area for development and had appointed a member of staff to coordinate and lead this area. The visitors welcomed the greater focus that was being placed on interaction and collaboration with placement providers as this is vital to the success of placements. The visitors therefore wished to encourage the education provider to continue to review, develop and strengthen its relationships with practice placement providers to ensure that collaboration in this area is effective.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to ensure that information provided about the number of credits awarded is clear and consistent.

Reason: The visitors noted the programme handbook contained conflicting information about the total number of credits that would be awarded for the programme and for individual modules. The visitors therefore suggested that the education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to ensure that the information about credits is accurate and consistent.

Kathryn Thirlaway
Rosemary Schaeffer

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science – Life Sciences (Blood Sciences)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	26 – 27 June 2012

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Biomedical scientist' 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 visitor on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 10 August 2012 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 23 August 2012. 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 17 August 2012. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 September 2012.

Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their currently approved BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programmes and reforming them into a new training route. Given the similarity between the approved programmes and the new programme, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the September 2012 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme with the caveat that the education provider will have to meet all conditions in this report including any conditions the visitors set specifically for the first cohort of students who will commence the programme in September 2012.

This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. This visit was part of a joint event as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes: BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences (Infection Sciences), BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences (Genetic Sciences), and BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences (Cellular Sciences). 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. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitor and profession	Robert Keeble (Biomedical Scientist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Niall Lennon
HPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	20
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2012
Chair	Patricia Rees (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Carmen Corral (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Members of the joint panel	Alan Wainwright (Institute of Biomedical Science) Christine Murphy (Institute of Biomedical Science) Jill Rodney (Institute of Biomedical Science)

	Andrew Usher (Institute of Biomedical Science)
--	--

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 Documentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 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.

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 submit further evidence of the information provided to applicants which clearly explains the pathways through the programme and the application process for these pathways.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitor noted that while the programme is advertised as BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences this is not the title of any of the programmes which lead to eligibility for registration with the HPC. Instead this is the generic title of a suite of programmes. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that applicants apply to this generic programme title and prior to enrolling are required to choose a pathway through the programme. However, the visitor did not see sufficient evidence of how applicants are suitably informed about the pathways through the programme. He also could not determine how applicants were informed about what these pathways entail, how to apply to these pathways and which of these would lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC register. The visitor therefore requires the programme team to provide further evidence which shows how applicants are provided with enough suitable information to ensure they are able to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly outline the management structure of the programme including the lines of responsibility and links to the management of practice placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions at the visit the visitor reviewed the management processes in place for the programme. At the visit itself, the visitor met with the programme team, senior staff and practice placement supervisors and discussed how various aspects of the programme are managed. However, from a review of the programme documentation and discussions at the visit the visitor noted that in some instances students may have to change placement during the programme due to the number of places available. The visitor noted that this could result in the student having not completed all of the expected competencies before having to move to an alternative placement site. The visitor was subsequently unclear about how a student progress would be monitored from one placement to another. The visitor requires the programme team to provide further evidence which clearly articulates how this would be managed and what processes are in place to ensure required learning outcomes would continue to be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence which clearly outlines how the programme documentation ensures students are given specific information regarding the pathways through the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitor noted that while the programme documentation contains information regarding all aspects of the programme the information itself was quite generic. The visitor also noted that documentation provided to students contained information on all pathways through the programme and both the physiological sciences and the life sciences routes. The visitor was concerned that as a result of this a student may have difficulty accessing relevant information specific to their route and pathway of choice. The visitor therefore requires the programme team to provide further evidence which shows how students are provided with clear and detailed information about aspects of the programme which are relevant to them specifically.

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

Condition: The education provider must update the programme documentation to clearly specify the indicative timetable for the first practice placement and what learning outcomes are to be achieved.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included details of the practice placements and specifically that during the first academic year students will spend 10 weeks on placement. However, during the visit it became clear that students stay with the education provider for the first two weeks of this practice placement and that only seven weeks would be spent at a specific laboratory. It was also articulated that this placement was intended more of a 'placement experience' rather than a period of time for students to start undertaking practical work. From the documentation provided the visitor could not determine where in the programme documentation the specific details of this placement were outlined. As this was the case, the visitor could not easily determine what was involved in this placement and which, if any, the standards of proficiency could be met by students undertaking this first placement. Therefore the education provider must provide further information to clearly explain the indicative timetable for the first practice placement. This information should also include which areas of competency students are intended to cover by the end of the first year placement. In this way the visitor can be sure that the duration and range of this practice placement is appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the formal processes which are in place involving the initial process of approving placements.

Reason: The visitor noted discussions with the programme team outlining the procedure in place for approving and monitoring placements. In particular the visitor was made aware that the first stage of approval of a placement provider is a placement agreement signed between the education provider, the Strategic Health Authority and the practice placement provider. However, the visitor could not determine, from the documentation provided, what this agreement concerns covers or includes. Therefore the visitor requires further evidence of the initial process involved with the approval of placements and how the signing of the placement agreement forms part of this process. In this way the visitor can be sure that the programme's system of approving and monitoring practice placements is thorough and effective.

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

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how they ensure that the practice placement educators and students are fully prepared to for practice placement.

Reason: The visitor noted during discussions at the visit that there has been a significant change in the way students will undertake placements in the new programme. Instead of taking one year to undertake all of their practical experience students will undertake smaller period of placement experience in each of the three years of the programme. However, through discussion with the practice placement providers the visitor was unclear about how the information about the new model of practice placement education had been provided to practice placement providers and educators. It was also the case that in reviewing the programme documentation the visitor was unclear about how students were provided with all of the relevant information they would need to be prepared for their placements. The visitor therefore requires further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement. In particular how they are made aware of the learning outcomes to be achieved on each placement, the relative timings and duration of any placement experience, expectations of professional conduct, the assessment procedures and the communication and lines of responsibility while a student is on placement. In this

way the visitor can be sure that everyone is fully prepared for placement and that this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate what awards confer eligibility to apply to the HPC Register those exit awards which do not.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitor was satisfied that anyone successfully completing the programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitor could not determine how students were informed about the various awards and their impact on the eligibility of a student to apply for the Register. Therefore the visitor requires further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HPC Register and which do not.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how best to split the current UCAS code to clearly identify the different routes a student may be able to take through the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science programmes.

Reason: In reviewing the documentation provided and in discussion at the visit the visitors were satisfied with the information provided for applicants regarding the UCAS code which relates solely to the overarching title for this suite of programmes; BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science. The visitor felt however that the application process for the programme may benefit with regards clarity should the UCAS code be split to better represent the differing routes offered through the BSc (Hons). Therefore the visitor recommends the education provider consider having two separate UCAS codes one which relates to the physiological sciences programmes and one for the life sciences programmes. In this way applicants to the programme may be able to more easily identify the differing programmes associated with the healthcare science and in particular those associated with the life sciences.

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

Recommendation: The visitor recommends the programme team consider producing a student handbook specifically for the life sciences programmes.

Reason: From documentation and discussion at the visit the visitor noted that the programme handbook contained relevant information for both the physiological sciences route and the life sciences route. The visitor felt however that students would benefit from having a student handbook specifically for the life sciences route as this would help ensure appropriate relevant information is readily available for students on these programmes. Therefore the visitor recommends the education provider consider having a student handbook specifically for the life sciences programmes. In this way the education provider may be able to further enhance the way the resources available support student learning on these programmes.

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

Recommendation: The visitor recommends the programme team continue to monitor how student consent is gained when they act as service users in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: The visitor noted in discussion with the practice placement providers and educators that students' consent is gained when they act as subjects for research purposes. This was reinforced in discussion with the programme team.

However, in the documentation provided the visitor noted that no evidence was provided to meet this standard. The visitor therefore recommends that the programme team continue to closely monitor how this consent is obtained to help ensure the protocols that are currently in place continue to be adhered to going forward. In this way the programme team may enhance how the programme meets this standard.

Robert Keeble

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science – Life Sciences (Cellular Sciences)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	26 – 27 June 2012

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Biomedical scientist' 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 visitor on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 10 August 2012 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 23 August 2012. 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 17 August 2012. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 September 2012.

Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their currently approved BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programmes and reforming them into a new training route. Given the similarity between the approved programmes and the new programme, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the September 2012 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme with the caveat that the education provider will have to meet all conditions in this report including any conditions the visitors set specifically for the first cohort of students who will commence the programme in September 2012.

This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. This visit was part of a joint event as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes: BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences (Infection Sciences), BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences (Genetic Sciences), and BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences (Blood Sciences). 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. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitor and profession	Robert Keeble (Biomedical Scientist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Niall Lennon
HPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	20
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2012
Chair	Patricia Rees (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Carmen Corral (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Members of the joint panel	Alan Wainwright (Institute of Biomedical Science) Christine Murphy (Institute of Biomedical Science) Jill Rodney (Institute of Biomedical Science)

	Andrew Usher (Institute of Biomedical Science)
--	--

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 Documentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 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.

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 submit further evidence of the information provided to applicants which clearly explains the pathways through the programme and the application process for these pathways.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitor noted that while the programme is advertised as BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences this is not the title of any of the programmes which lead to eligibility for registration with the HPC. Instead this is the generic title of a suite of programmes. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that applicants apply to this generic programme title and prior to enrolling are required to choose a pathway through the programme. However, the visitor did not see sufficient evidence of how applicants are suitably informed about the pathways through the programme. He also could not determine how applicants were informed about what these pathways entail, how to apply to these pathways and which of these would lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC register. The visitor therefore requires the programme team to provide further evidence which shows how applicants are provided with enough suitable information to ensure they are able to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly outline the management structure of the programme including the lines of responsibility and links to the management of practice placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions at the visit the visitor reviewed the management processes in place for the programme. At the visit itself, the visitor met with the programme team, senior staff and practice placement supervisors and discussed how various aspects of the programme are managed. However, from a review of the programme documentation and discussions at the visit the visitor noted that in some instances students may have to change placement during the programme due to the number of places available. The visitor noted that this could result in the student having not completed all of the expected competencies before having to move to an alternative placement site. The visitor was subsequently unclear about how a student progress would be monitored from one placement to another. The visitor requires the programme team to provide further evidence which clearly articulates how this would be managed and what processes are in place to ensure required learning outcomes would continue to be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence which clearly outlines how the programme documentation ensures students are given specific information regarding the pathways through the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitor noted that while the programme documentation contains information regarding all aspects of the programme the information itself was quite generic. The visitor also noted that documentation provided to students contained information on all pathways through the programme and both the physiological sciences and the life sciences routes. The visitor was concerned that as a result of this a student may have difficulty accessing relevant information specific to their route and pathway of choice. The visitor therefore requires the programme team to provide further evidence which shows how students are provided with clear and detailed information about aspects of the programme which are relevant to them specifically.

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

Condition: The education provider must update the programme documentation to clearly specify the indicative timetable for the first practice placement and what learning outcomes are to be achieved.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included details of the practice placements and specifically that during the first academic year students will spend 10 weeks on placement. However, during the visit it became clear that students stay with the education provider for the first two weeks of this practice placement and that only seven weeks would be spent at a specific laboratory. It was also articulated that this placement was intended more of a 'placement experience' rather than a period of time for students to start undertaking practical work. From the documentation provided the visitor could not determine where in the programme documentation the specific details of this placement were outlined. As this was the case, the visitor could not easily determine what was involved in this placement and which, if any, the standards of proficiency could be met by students undertaking this first placement. Therefore the education provider must provide further information to clearly explain the indicative timetable for the first practice placement. This information should also include which areas of competency students are intended to cover by the end of the first year placement. In this way the visitor can be sure that the duration and range of this practice placement is appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the formal processes which are in place involving the initial process of approving placements.

Reason: The visitor noted discussions with the programme team outlining the procedure in place for approving and monitoring placements. In particular the visitor was made aware that the first stage of approval of a placement provider is a placement agreement signed between the education provider, the Strategic Health Authority and the practice placement provider. However, the visitor could not determine, from the documentation provided, what this agreement concerns covers or includes. Therefore the visitor requires further evidence of the initial process involved with the approval of placements and how the signing of the placement agreement forms part of this process. In this way the visitor can be sure that the programme's system of approving and monitoring practice placements is thorough and effective.

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

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how they ensure that the practice placement educators and students are fully prepared to for practice placement.

Reason: The visitor noted during discussions at the visit that there has been a significant change in the way students will undertake placements in the new programme. Instead of taking one year to undertake all of their practical experience students will undertake smaller period of placement experience in each of the three years of the programme. However, through discussion with the practice placement providers the visitor was unclear about how the information about the new model of practice placement education had been provided to practice placement providers and educators. It was also the case that in reviewing the programme documentation the visitor was unclear about how students were provided with all of the relevant information they would need to be prepared for their placements. The visitor therefore requires further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement. In particular how they are made aware of the learning outcomes to be achieved on each placement, the relative timings and duration of any placement experience, expectations of professional conduct, the assessment procedures and the communication and lines of responsibility while a student is on placement. In this

way the visitor can be sure that everyone is fully prepared for placement and that this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate what awards confer eligibility to apply to the HPC Register those exit awards which do not.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitor was satisfied that anyone successfully completing the programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitor could not determine how students were informed about the various awards and their impact on the eligibility of a student to apply for the Register. Therefore the visitor requires further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HPC Register and which do not.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how best to split the current UCAS code to clearly identify the different routes a student may be able to take through the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science programmes.

Reason: In reviewing the documentation provided and in discussion at the visit the visitors were satisfied with the information provided for applicants regarding the UCAS code which relates solely to the overarching title for this suite of programmes; BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science. The visitor felt however that the application process for the programme may benefit with regards clarity should the UCAS code be split to better represent the differing routes offered through the BSc (Hons). Therefore the visitor recommends the education provider consider having two separate UCAS codes one which relates to the physiological sciences programmes and one for the life sciences programmes. In this way applicants to the programme may be able to more easily identify the differing programmes associated with the healthcare science and in particular those associated with the life sciences.

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

Recommendation: The visitor recommends the programme team consider producing a student handbook specifically for the life sciences programmes.

Reason: From documentation and discussion at the visit the visitor noted that the programme handbook contained relevant information for both the physiological sciences route and the life sciences route. The visitor felt however that students would benefit from having a student handbook specifically for the life sciences route as this would help ensure appropriate relevant information is readily available for students on these programmes. Therefore the visitor recommends the education provider consider having a student handbook specifically for the life sciences programmes. In this way the education provider may be able to further enhance the way the resources available support student learning on these programmes.

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

Recommendation: The visitor recommends the programme team continue to monitor how student consent is gained when they act as service users in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: The visitor noted in discussion with the practice placement providers and educators that students' consent is gained when they act as subjects for research purposes. This was reinforced in discussion with the programme team.

However, in the documentation provided the visitor noted that no evidence was provided to meet this standard. The visitor therefore recommends that the programme team continue to closely monitor how this consent is obtained to help ensure the protocols that are currently in place continue to be adhered to going forward. In this way the programme team may enhance how the programme meets this standard.

Robert Keeble

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science – Life Sciences (Genetic Sciences)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	26 – 27 June 2012

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Biomedical scientist' 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 visitor on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 10 August 2012 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 23 August 2012. 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 17 August 2012. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 September 2012.

Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their currently approved BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programmes and reforming them into a new training route. Given the similarity between the approved programmes and the new programme, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the September 2012 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme with the caveat that the education provider will have to meet all conditions in this report including any conditions the visitors set specifically for the first cohort of students who will commence the programme in September 2012.

This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. This visit was part of a joint event as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes: BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences (Infection Sciences), BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences (Cellular Sciences), and BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences (Blood Sciences). 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. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitor and profession	Robert Keeble (Biomedical Scientist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Niall Lennon
HPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	20
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2012
Chair	Patricia Rees (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Carmen Corral (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Members of the joint panel	Alan Wainwright (Institute of Biomedical Science) Christine Murphy (Institute of Biomedical Science) Jill Rodney (Institute of Biomedical Science)

	Andrew Usher (Institute of Biomedical Science)
--	--

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 Documentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 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.

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 submit further evidence of the information provided to applicants which clearly explains the pathways through the programme and the application process for these pathways.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitor noted that while the programme is advertised as BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences this is not the title of any of the programmes which lead to eligibility for registration with the HPC. Instead this is the generic title of a suite of programmes. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that applicants apply to this generic programme title and prior to enrolling are required to choose a pathway through the programme. However, the visitor did not see sufficient evidence of how applicants are suitably informed about the pathways through the programme. He also could not determine how applicants were informed about what these pathways entail, how to apply to these pathways and which of these would lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC register. The visitor therefore requires the programme team to provide further evidence which shows how applicants are provided with enough suitable information to ensure they are able to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly outline the management structure of the programme including the lines of responsibility and links to the management of practice placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions at the visit the visitor reviewed the management processes in place for the programme. At the visit itself, the visitor met with the programme team, senior staff and practice placement supervisors and discussed how various aspects of the programme are managed. However, from a review of the programme documentation and discussions at the visit the visitor noted that in some instances students may have to change placement during the programme due to the number of places available. The visitor noted that this could result in the student having not completed all of the expected competencies before having to move to an alternative placement site. The visitor was subsequently unclear about how a student progress would be monitored from one placement to another. The visitor requires the programme team to provide further evidence which clearly articulates how this would be managed and what processes are in place to ensure required learning outcomes would continue to be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence which clearly outlines how the programme documentation ensures students are given specific information regarding the pathways through the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitor noted that while the programme documentation contains information regarding all aspects of the programme the information itself was quite generic. The visitor also noted that documentation provided to students contained information on all pathways through the programme and both the physiological sciences and the life sciences routes. The visitor was concerned that as a result of this a student may have difficulty accessing relevant information specific to their route and pathway of choice. The visitor therefore requires the programme team to provide further evidence which shows how students are provided with clear and detailed information about aspects of the programme which are relevant to them specifically.

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

Condition: The education provider must update the programme documentation to clearly specify the indicative timetable for the first practice placement and what learning outcomes are to be achieved.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included details of the practice placements and specifically that during the first academic year students will spend 10 weeks on placement. However, during the visit it became clear that students stay with the education provider for the first two weeks of this practice placement and that only seven weeks would be spent at a specific laboratory. It was also articulated that this placement was intended more of a 'placement experience' rather than a period of time for students to start undertaking practical work. From the documentation provided the visitor could not determine where in the programme documentation the specific details of this placement were outlined. As this was the case, the visitor could not easily determine what was involved in this placement and which, if any, the standards of proficiency could be met by students undertaking this first placement. Therefore the education provider must provide further information to clearly explain the indicative timetable for the first practice placement. This information should also include which areas of competency students are intended to cover by the end of the first year placement. In this way the visitor can be sure that the duration and range of this practice placement is appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the formal processes which are in place involving the initial process of approving placements.

Reason: The visitor noted discussions with the programme team outlining the procedure in place for approving and monitoring placements. In particular the visitor was made aware that the first stage of approval of a placement provider is a placement agreement signed between the education provider, the Strategic Health Authority and the practice placement provider. However, the visitor could not determine, from the documentation provided, what this agreement concerns covers or includes. Therefore the visitor requires further evidence of the initial process involved with the approval of placements and how the signing of the placement agreement forms part of this process. In this way the visitor can be sure that the programme's system of approving and monitoring practice placements is thorough and effective.

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

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how they ensure that the practice placement educators and students are fully prepared to for practice placement.

Reason: The visitor noted during discussions at the visit that there has been a significant change in the way students will undertake placements in the new programme. Instead of taking one year to undertake all of their practical experience students will undertake smaller period of placement experience in each of the three years of the programme. However, through discussion with the practice placement providers the visitor was unclear about how the information about the new model of practice placement education had been provided to practice placement providers and educators. It was also the case that in reviewing the programme documentation the visitor was unclear about how students were provided with all of the relevant information they would need to be prepared for their placements. The visitor therefore requires further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement. In particular how they are made aware of the learning outcomes to be achieved on each placement, the relative timings and duration of any placement experience, expectations of professional conduct, the assessment procedures and the communication and lines of responsibility while a student is on placement. In this

way the visitor can be sure that everyone is fully prepared for placement and that this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate what awards confer eligibility to apply to the HPC Register those exit awards which do not.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitor was satisfied that anyone successfully completing the programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitor could not determine how students were informed about the various awards and their impact on the eligibility of a student to apply for the Register. Therefore the visitor requires further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HPC Register and which do not.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how best to split the current UCAS code to clearly identify the different routes a student may be able to take through the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science programmes.

Reason: In reviewing the documentation provided and in discussion at the visit the visitors were satisfied with the information provided for applicants regarding the UCAS code which relates solely to the overarching title for this suite of programmes; BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science. The visitor felt however that the application process for the programme may benefit with regards clarity should the UCAS code be split to better represent the differing routes offered through the BSc (Hons). Therefore the visitor recommends the education provider consider having two separate UCAS codes one which relates to the physiological sciences programmes and one for the life sciences programmes. In this way applicants to the programme may be able to more easily identify the differing programmes associated with the healthcare science and in particular those associated with the life sciences.

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

Recommendation: The visitor recommends the programme team consider producing a student handbook specifically for the life sciences programmes.

Reason: From documentation and discussion at the visit the visitor noted that the programme handbook contained relevant information for both the physiological sciences route and the life sciences route. The visitor felt however that students would benefit from having a student handbook specifically for the life sciences route as this would help ensure appropriate relevant information is readily available for students on these programmes. Therefore the visitor recommends the education provider consider having a student handbook specifically for the life sciences programmes. In this way the education provider may be able to further enhance the way the resources available support student learning on these programmes.

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

Recommendation: The visitor recommends the programme team continue to monitor how student consent is gained when they act as service users in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: The visitor noted in discussion with the practice placement providers and educators that students' consent is gained when they act as subjects for research purposes. This was reinforced in discussion with the programme team.

However, in the documentation provided the visitor noted that no evidence was provided to meet this standard. The visitor therefore recommends that the programme team continue to closely monitor how this consent is obtained to help ensure the protocols that are currently in place continue to be adhered to going forward. In this way the programme team may enhance how the programme meets this standard.

Robert Keeble

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science – Life Sciences (Infection Sciences)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	26 – 27 June 2012

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Biomedical scientist' 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 visitor on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 10 August 2012 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 23 August 2012. 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 17 August 2012. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 September 2012.

Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their currently approved BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programmes and reforming them into a new training route. Given the similarity between the approved programmes and the new programme, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the September 2012 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme with the caveat that the education provider will have to meet all conditions in this report including any conditions the visitors set specifically for the first cohort of students who will commence the programme in September 2012.

This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. This visit was part of a joint event as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes: BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences (Genetic Sciences), BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences (Cellular Sciences), and BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences (Blood Sciences). 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. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitor and profession	Robert Keeble (Biomedical Scientist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Niall Lennon
HPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	20
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2012
Chair	Patricia Rees (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Carmen Corral (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Members of the joint panel	Alan Wainwright (Institute of Biomedical Science) Christine Murphy (Institute of Biomedical Science) Jill Rodney (Institute of Biomedical Science)

	Andrew Usher (Institute of Biomedical Science)
--	--

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 Documentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

The HPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 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.

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 submit further evidence of the information provided to applicants which clearly explains the pathways through the programme and the application process for these pathways.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitor noted that while the programme is advertised as BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science - Life Sciences this is not the title of any of the programmes which lead to eligibility for registration with the HPC. Instead this is the generic title of a suite of programmes. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that applicants apply to this generic programme title and prior to enrolling are required to choose a pathway through the programme. However, the visitor did not see sufficient evidence of how applicants are suitably informed about the pathways through the programme. He also could not determine how applicants were informed about what these pathways entail, how to apply to these pathways and which of these would lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC register. The visitor therefore requires the programme team to provide further evidence which shows how applicants are provided with enough suitable information to ensure they are able to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly outline the management structure of the programme including the lines of responsibility and links to the management of practice placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions at the visit the visitor reviewed the management processes in place for the programme. At the visit itself, the visitor met with the programme team, senior staff and practice placement supervisors and discussed how various aspects of the programme are managed. However, from a review of the programme documentation and discussions at the visit the visitor noted that in some instances students may have to change placement during the programme due to the number of places available. The visitor noted that this could result in the student having not completed all of the expected competencies before having to move to an alternative placement site. The visitor was subsequently unclear about how a student progress would be monitored from one placement to another. The visitor requires the programme team to provide further evidence which clearly articulates how this would be managed and what processes are in place to ensure required learning outcomes would continue to be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence which clearly outlines how the programme documentation ensures students are given specific information regarding the pathways through the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitor noted that while the programme documentation contains information regarding all aspects of the programme the information itself was quite generic. The visitor also noted that documentation provided to students contained information on all pathways through the programme and both the physiological sciences and the life sciences routes. The visitor was concerned that as a result of this a student may have difficulty accessing relevant information specific to their route and pathway of choice. The visitor therefore requires the programme team to provide further evidence which shows how students are provided with clear and detailed information about aspects of the programme which are relevant to them specifically.

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

Condition: The education provider must update the programme documentation to clearly specify the indicative timetable for the first practice placement and what learning outcomes are to be achieved.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included details of the practice placements and specifically that during the first academic year students will spend 10 weeks on placement. However, during the visit it became clear that students stay with the education provider for the first two weeks of this practice placement and that only seven weeks would be spent at a specific laboratory. It was also articulated that this placement was intended more of a 'placement experience' rather than a period of time for students to start undertaking practical work. From the documentation provided the visitor could not determine where in the programme documentation the specific details of this placement were outlined. As this was the case, the visitor could not easily determine what was involved in this placement and which, if any, the standards of proficiency could be met by students undertaking this first placement. Therefore the education provider must provide further information to clearly explain the indicative timetable for the first practice placement. This information should also include which areas of competency students are intended to cover by the end of the first year placement. In this way the visitor can be sure that the duration and range of this practice placement is appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the formal processes which are in place involving the initial process of approving placements.

Reason: The visitor noted discussions with the programme team outlining the procedure in place for approving and monitoring placements. In particular the visitor was made aware that the first stage of approval of a placement provider is a placement agreement signed between the education provider, the Strategic Health Authority and the practice placement provider. However, the visitor could not determine, from the documentation provided, what this agreement concerns covers or includes. Therefore the visitor requires further evidence of the initial process involved with the approval of placements and how the signing of the placement agreement forms part of this process. In this way the visitor can be sure that the programme's system of approving and monitoring practice placements is thorough and effective.

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

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how they ensure that the practice placement educators and students are fully prepared to for practice placement.

Reason: The visitor noted during discussions at the visit that there has been a significant change in the way students will undertake placements in the new programme. Instead of taking one year to undertake all of their practical experience students will undertake smaller period of placement experience in each of the three years of the programme. However, through discussion with the practice placement providers the visitor was unclear about how the information about the new model of practice placement education had been provided to practice placement providers and educators. It was also the case that in reviewing the programme documentation the visitor was unclear about how students were provided with all of the relevant information they would need to be prepared for their placements. The visitor therefore requires further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement. In particular how they are made aware of the learning outcomes to be achieved on each placement, the relative timings and duration of any placement experience, expectations of professional conduct, the assessment procedures and the communication and lines of responsibility while a student is on placement. In this

way the visitor can be sure that everyone is fully prepared for placement and that this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate what awards confer eligibility to apply to the HPC Register those exit awards which do not.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitor was satisfied that anyone successfully completing the programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitor could not determine how students were informed about the various awards and their impact on the eligibility of a student to apply for the Register. Therefore the visitor requires further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HPC Register and which do not.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how best to split the current UCAS code to clearly identify the different routes a student may be able to take through the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science programmes.

Reason: In reviewing the documentation provided and in discussion at the visit the visitors were satisfied with the information provided for applicants regarding the UCAS code which relates solely to the overarching title for this suite of programmes; BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science. The visitor felt however that the application process for the programme may benefit with regards clarity should the UCAS code be split to better represent the differing routes offered through the BSc (Hons). Therefore the visitor recommends the education provider consider having two separate UCAS codes one which relates to the physiological sciences programmes and one for the life sciences programmes. In this way applicants to the programme may be able to more easily identify the differing programmes associated with the healthcare science and in particular those associated with the life sciences.

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

Recommendation: The visitor recommends the programme team consider producing a student handbook specifically for the life sciences programmes.

Reason: From documentation and discussion at the visit the visitor noted that the programme handbook contained relevant information for both the physiological sciences route and the life sciences route. The visitor felt however that students would benefit from having a student handbook specifically for the life sciences route as this would help ensure appropriate relevant information is readily available for students on these programmes. Therefore the visitor recommends the education provider consider having a student handbook specifically for the life sciences programmes. In this way the education provider may be able to further enhance the way the resources available support student learning on these programmes.

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

Recommendation: The visitor recommends the programme team continue to monitor how student consent is gained when they act as service users in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: The visitor noted in discussion with the practice placement providers and educators that students' consent is gained when they act as subjects for research purposes. This was reinforced in discussion with the programme team.

However, in the documentation provided the visitor noted that no evidence was provided to meet this standard. The visitor therefore recommends that the programme team continue to closely monitor how this consent is obtained to help ensure the protocols that are currently in place continue to be adhered to going forward. In this way the programme team may enhance how the programme meets this standard.

Robert Keeble

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Outreach Rescue and Medic Skills
Programme name	Hazardous Environment Medicine Paramedic Award
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	12 – 13 June 2012

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 23 July 2012 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 23 August 2012. 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 10 July 2012. 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 13 September 2012.

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 an HPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Vince Clarke (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2012
Chair	Phil Benbow (Betsi Cadwalader University Health Board Trust)
Secretary	Beccy Bray (Outreach Rescue)

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"/>
Education provider guides, policy documentation and procedural documentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review External examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as this type of documentation does not exist.

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

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

The HPC met with students from the Intermediate Module 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 made one recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revise programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure that the expectation of the level of support that the applicant will need from their employer (the client) is clearly articulated.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted and through discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider collaborates with clients whose employees are able to apply to become students on the programme. The programme documentation stated that “all course nominations must be followed by a declaration of conformity ... from their organisation [the client]” (Course specification). The visitors noted that the programme is designed so that the client provides a significant contribution in terms of the learning environment and resources the student needs to complete the programme. The visitors considered the level of support needed from the client for the student to be considerable and noted that this expectation was not described fully from the outset through the advertising materials and only became apparent once negotiations take place between the education provider and the client. The visitors considered further detail about the arrangements between the client, the student and the education provider to be important in order that all required information is available to applicants and potential applicants for them to be able to make an informed decision about applying for a place on the programme. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation and advertising materials to be revised to ensure they clearly articulate the expectation of the level of support the applicant will need from their employer (the client).

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate how collaborative arrangements are agreed between clients and the education provider.

Reason: In the documentation submitted and through discussions at the visit, the visitors identified how the programme is managed. The education provider collaborates with clients whose employees are able to apply to become students on the programme. The client is required to provide a student with the appropriate learning opportunities to allow them to complete the placement elements of the programme. From the evidence provided the visitors were unable to determine how collaborative arrangements were agreed and maintained. The visitors also noted clients for the programme may be distributed across the UK and offer differing learning environments for the students to work in. For these reasons the visitors were concerned there was no agreement, such as a contract or memorandum of understanding that the education provider and client would sign and be held accountable to. The visitors judged it to be important that such an agreement be in place to clearly identify the expectations of the education provider, the expectations of the client, the programme requirements, the student

requirements and the resource requirements. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence to demonstrate how collaborative arrangements between clients and the education provider are agreed.

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

Condition: The education provider must resubmit the finalised programme documentation and ensure errors and inaccuracies are corrected.

Reason: The documentation the visitors reviewed prior to the visit were in draft form. At the visit the education provider had later drafts printed and the visitors are aware that as a result of this visit documentation will be revised further. During the review of the initial documentation the visitors noted some inaccuracies. They noted the Educational Audit for placements had a reference to “state registered practitioners” (p6). This terminology is out of date and no longer used. They also noted the HPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics referred to as the “HPC Code of Professional Conduct” (Practice Placement Educators Handbook p5). To ensure the documentation is appropriate for the programme the visitors require the education provider to review, correct errors and inaccuracies and then resubmit the finalised programme documentation.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they will ensure students’ placements will be appropriate to support the students’ achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: Discussion and documentation indicated how the placements are managed. The visitors noted that the students’ workplaces are also their placement environments. The visitors noted that the students may be employed in a wide variety of work environments yet have the same learning outcomes to achieve. Discussion indicated the programme would assess each placement environment to ensure suitability with learning experience and learning outcomes and additional placement areas would be sourced as necessary. The visitors were unable to determine how the programme and the client would manage the sourcing of other placements to ensure learning outcomes are able to be achieved. The visitors suggest the programme team consider the condition under SET 3.2 alongside this condition to ensure the placements are managed effectively. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme will ensure students’ placements will be appropriate to support the students’ achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

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

Condition: The education provider must revise documentation to clarify the expectations for the proportion of time needed for students to spend working under direct supervision with their practice placement educator (PPEd).

Reason: Discussion and documentation indicated how practice placements are managed. The visitors noted that the students' workplaces are also their placement environments with additional placement areas sourced as necessary. The visitors were concerned that during the workplace situated placements the boundaries between what constitutes the practice placement and what constitutes the regular employment could become unclear without clear guidance as to how the supervision arrangements work. To ensure all students will have the same experiences across the placements the visitors require the education provider to revise documentation to clearly articulate the expectations for the proportion of time required for the student to spend working under direct supervision with their PPEd.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise programme documentation to further clarify the grades required in order to pass modules and the difference between passing modules and passing assignments.

Reason: In the documentation submitted prior to the visit the visitors noted some confusing information regarding the grades needed to pass an assessment. The Student Handbook stated for the theory assessments and the post attendance assignments "the student will need to achieve a grade C in each element to successfully complete the module" (p17). The student handbook additionally signposted students to the assessment schemes in Appendix B where the scheme on p24 indicated a grade E was equal to a classification of 'pass'. The visitors considered this to be confusing for students looking at what they were required to achieve in order to successfully complete an assignment and a module. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified the pass of a module was not the same as a pass for the assignment. The visitors therefore require the student handbook to be revised to further clarify the grades required in order to pass modules and the difference between passing modules and passing assignments.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise programme documentation to clearly articulate that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail in the programmes external examiner recruitment policy. In discussions the programme team indicated that they would be creating a policy to use when recruiting external examiners. The standards require the programme team to recruit at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the register and, if they are not, to inform the HPC through our major change process. The visitors require the education provider to revise programme documentation to clearly articulate this information to show adherence to this standard.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider could revise programme documentation to further clarify that the step off or exit award in place for this programme does not lead to eligibility to apply for HPC registration.

Reason: In the documentation submitted prior to the visit the visitors noted references to a step off or exit award available for the programme, "Hazardous Environment Medical Technician" (p2, Portfolio 1). The visitors noted this award title does not contain a protected title so agreed it is not misleading, however felt that the education provider could more clearly articulate to students that the step off award will not lead to eligibility to apply for HPC registration. The visitors suggest the programme documentation (for example the student handbook and course specification) could be to be revised to include this information.

Paul Bates
Vince Clarke

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Newcastle University
Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Clinical psychologist
Date of visit	5 – 6 July 2012

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 13 August 2012 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 23 August 2012. 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 October 2012. 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 4 December 2012.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the 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 bod, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) Steve Davies (Clinical psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	14 per cohort
First approved intake	January 1995
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Ashley Wilson (Newcastle University)
Secretary	Simon Meacher (Newcastle University)
Members of the joint panel	Andrew Thompson (British Psychological Society) Simon Eltringham (British Psychological Society) Barbara Mason (British Psychological Society) Molly Ross (British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other evidence: relevant policies, procedures and regulations; curriculum timetables and documentation; various programme committee and meeting minutes; programme review documentation; placement documentation; admission procedure documentation; physical and electronic resource information.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure new placement settings are initially approved and effectively monitored.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated how the programme team work collaboratively with placements. All placements used are long standing existing placements and have been contractually fulfilled since 2003. Discussion indicated the annual placement audits, placement meetings, trainee feedback and liaison committee meetings are how the education provider maintained the relationships and monitored the placements. These monitoring arrangements are held and agreed within the placement contractual agreements and the individual trainee placement contracts. The visitors were confident the relationships in place with the current placements were strong and viable. The visitors are aware of the wider context to psychology and are aware in the future new placements may need to be sourced, they are also aware that when sourcing new placements the programme team may need to look outside of the traditional NHS settings. The visitors were concerned the education provider may not have policies and procedures in place for approving and monitoring new placements thereby ensuring the clinical supervisor and clinical environment are suitable, appropriately safe and supportive for the trainees to work with. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team would ensure new placement settings are approved and effectively monitored.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure clinical supervisors undertake regular refresher training.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated that the programme team arranges regular initial and refresher training sessions for clinical supervisors. Discussion with the clinical supervisors and the programme team indicated that prior to working with students the training needs of a clinical supervisor would be reviewed and appropriate training would be arranged for them. Discussion with the clinical supervisors indicated the placement managers received attendance lists from the refresher sessions which they used to follow up and ensure clinical supervisors had undertaken training or if not were then scheduled in for refresher training. Discussion with the programme team indicated they took the attendance lists for the refresher training however did not review them or use them to highlight clinical supervisors who had not attended refresher training and who may need prompting to undertake training. The visitors were concerned there was the possibility of gaps between the placement managers reviewing refresher training attendance and the programme team's responsibility to do this. The visitors suggest a system whereby the programme

team and the placement managers work together to review refresher training attendance to ensure all clinical supervisors receive updates to their supervision training, programme updates or placement management updates. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensure clinical supervisors undertake regular refresher training.

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 visitors suggest the education provider expand the information given in the advertising materials.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the advertising materials and noted the programme website information and the programme factsheets available state “offers of places subsequently made will be subject to: an enhanced criminal records check, medical clearance and satisfactory references.” Although this is sufficient to meet the standard of giving applicants information about the medical clearance and criminal conviction check, the visitors suggest the education provider expand on this information. The visitors felt further information could be provided to explain how each case is assessed and to highlight that efforts to ensure potential trainee disability needs and adjustments could be made where possible. The visitors felt that this would encourage those applicants who may have specific needs on health grounds or who are concerned about the criminal conviction check and whether the course may help them.

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team formulate a strategy to ensure the consistent implementation of equality and diversity approaches and so widen the access to the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team and senior team, the visitors noted evidence of an equality and diversity policy and evidence that the programme team are considering various ideas for widening access to this programme. The visitors suggest the programme team consider formulating an equality and diversity strategy at a programme level to ensure the work that is currently being deliberated upon around equality and diversity is conducted in a consistent, transparent and measured way.

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team consider ways to monitor trainee’s attendance alongside the occurrence of ‘opting-out’ of teaching sessions.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included information about the consent protocols in place. If needed, trainees could 'opt out' of particular sensitive or personal aspects of the programme and excuse themselves from the session. The visitors were aware that missing out on certain sessions by using the consent procedures may cause problems, particularly if this was a repeated incident and was not picked up by the programme team. The visitors suggest the programme team consider ways to monitor trainee's attendance alongside the occurrence of 'opting-out' of teaching sessions to be able to manage absences effectively.

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team consider ways to ensure trainee's attendance at placement is monitored.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated the programme has a robust attendance policy at the education provider with careful monitoring of trainee attendance. Programme documentation clearly highlights the amount of days per week needed for each placement (p4, Placement Handbook) and the requirement for trainees to inform the programme team of absence from any part of the programme (p25, Programme Handbook – draft for 2012 intake). The visitors felt this indicated it was the trainee's responsibility to inform all parties of any absence. The visitors felt there was the potential here for trainee's to not inform all parties of absence and for it to therefore go unnoticed. The visitors recommend the programme team consider ways to ensure that absences whilst on placement are communicated to the programme team for them to be able to manage absences effectively.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team formulate a strategy to formally embed service users within the programme.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated service users contribute in a variety of ways to the programme, through the admission procedures and through some teaching. The visitors noted although service users did contribute towards the programme delivery there was no standard system for considering how and when to involve service users. The visitors felt that service users are a valuable resource for the programme and could be further embedded into the programme by having a formal strategic plan for involving service users.

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team consider reviewing the programme to further emphasise the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From the visitors' review of the programme, programme documentation and discussions at the visit, the visitors were satisfied the programme would ensure trainees understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors did note that there were areas of the programme that they considered could be enhanced by including information about the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and making reference to the HPC's Guidance on conduct and ethics for students. The visitors recommend the programme team review the programme and consider where they can further emphasise the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors suggest this would strengthen the students' understanding of the implications of the HPC's 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 visitors suggest the programme team continue to ensure they will receive and review placement competencies.

Reason: Discussion with the programme team indicated the trainee's placement contract and placement record was completed at the end of placement and then taken to the following placement. At the beginning of the new placement the forms would then be used to identify any gaps in the trainee's demonstrated competencies. The forms are agreed and signed by the trainee and the clinical supervisors at the end and beginning of each placement. The programme team receives copies of the forms in order to review the competencies being fulfilled at one placement and planned to be reached at the next. The visitors note how important it is for the active review of the competencies to be undertaken in order to ensure the contracts are appropriately focusing on areas of the competencies that need addressing. The visitors suggest the programme team continue to ensure this is being appropriately undertaken.

Sabiha Azmi
Steve Davies

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Birmingham
Programme name	Forensic Clinical Psychology Doctorate (ForenClinPsyD)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Forensic psychologist Clinical psychologist
Date of visit	28 – 29 June 2012

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', 'Forensic 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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 13 August 2012 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 23 August 2012. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 4 February 2013. 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 27 March 2013.

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 an HPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Laura Golding (Clinical psychologist) George Delafield (Forensic psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	David Christopher
Proposed student numbers	5 per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Roy Harrison (28 June 2012) (University of Birmingham) John Tellam (29 June 2012) (University of Birmingham)
Secretary	Rupy Kahlon (University of Birmingham)

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
HPC visit appendices	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review a separate practice placement handbook as the documentation does not exist. A separate practice placement handbook has not been produced. The information is included at section C of the programme handbook.

The HPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit. As this is a new programme seeking approval the documentation does not exist.

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

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

The HPC met with students from the Clinical Psychology Doctorate (ClinPsyD) and one student from the Doctorate in Forensic Psychology Practice (ForenPsyD), 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 recommendation for the programme.

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

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 develop promotional materials, which give applicants and the education provider all the information required to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: The list of documents provided prior to the visit included reference to a course brochure. However, this was not provided and in discussions the programme team confirmed that a course brochure and other promotional materials had not yet been produced. The visitors noted that in alternate years places on the programme would be funded by a practice placement provider and only available to employees it funded as students. It would therefore be important for the course brochure and promotional materials to make clear who was eligible to apply in any given year. The visitors also noted that there would be no accreditation of prior (experiential) learning mechanism for the programme, which needed to be made clear to applicants in promotional materials. The visitors also considered that the information about the previous experience required by applicants needed further elaboration so it could be communicated to applicants. Consequently, the visitors require the education provider to develop promotional materials, which give applicants and the education provider all the information required to make informed choices about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on the programme. The visitors consider the condition under SET 2.5 to link with this condition.

2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the previous experience required by applicants that will be applied as selection and entry criteria.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included a SETs mapping document, which indicated that applicants would be required to have previous experience or be currently working in a forensic setting. However, in the absence of promotional materials for this programme, it was unclear what the education provider's precise requirements were in relation to prior experience. The visitors need further information about the previous experience the education provider expects applicants to have to be assured that the programme will apply appropriate academic and/or professional standards. This standard also requires that applicants are made aware of the entry criteria for this programme. As such the visitors also require the education provider to further elaborate and clarify its requirements in relation to previous experience to applicants, to ensure that this standard is met. The visitors consider the condition under SET 2.1 to link with this condition.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme handbook and other documentation to ensure that it supports student learning.

Reason: The programme documentation provided prior to the visit included a programme handbook. This handbook indicated that the programme would be delivered over a four year period, with the first two years being full time study and the final two years being part time study. However, discussions with the programme team indicated that the education provider intended to restructure the programme and deliver it over four years of full time study. The visitors noted that this change would inevitably lead to some restructuring of the programme and the way it was delivered, which would need to be reflected in the handbook and other documentation. The visitors therefore require the education provider to review the programme handbook and other documentation to reflect the intention to deliver it over four years of full time study to ensure that this material supports student learning.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to show how the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for clinical and forensic psychologists.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included a programme specification and a programme handbook, which included module descriptions, together with mapping documents showing how the SETs and SOPs were met. The programme is innovative as it is designed to cover the SOPs for both clinical and forensic psychologists. However, as indicated in the condition set against SET 3.8, discussions with the programme team indicated an intention to deliver the programme over four years of full time study instead of the two years of full study plus two years of part time study originally intended. The visitors noted that this change would inevitably lead to some restructuring of the programme and the way it was delivered, which would need to be reflected in the programme documentation. The visitors therefore require the education provider to review the programme documentation, in the light of the intention to deliver the programme over four years of full time study, to show how it ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for clinical and forensic psychologists. The visitors consider the condition under SET 5.2 and 6.1 to link with this condition.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate how it will ensure that there is an appropriate range of practice

placements to support delivery of the programme and achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included mapping documents that showed how the SOPs for clinical and forensic psychologists were addressed. The documentation provided information about the practice placement element of the programme. However, it was unclear to the visitors whether the placements available would allow students to gain experience in a range of settings and with a variety of clientele and so achieve all the learning outcomes. Discussions with colleagues from St Andrew's Healthcare, a practice placement provider that would fund students on the programme in alternate years, revealed that this provider could offer experience of working with adults, adolescents and older patients. However, it would be necessary to undertake placements with other providers to gain experience of working with younger children and in the community. The programme team confirmed that the required placements could be provided by a number of other providers, but the visitors were not provided with any information about the range of placements available or the education provider's strategy for ensuring that placements would support all students to meet all the learning outcomes and in so doing the SOPs for both clinical and forensic psychologists. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further information to demonstrate that there is an appropriate range of placements to support students to achieve all the learning outcomes. The visitors consider the condition under SET 4.1 to link with this condition.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to articulate clearly the process for approving and monitoring placements.

Reason: The programme documentation provided prior to the visit included information about the practice placement element of the programme, including the role of the appraisal tutor and the process for monitoring student performance and development. In discussions, the programme team confirmed their intention was to use the appraisal tutor system to visit placements and help to ensure that they provide a high quality teaching and learning experience for students. However, the visitors could not determine how this system would thoroughly and effectively approve and monitor all placements. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence to articulate more clearly the processes for approving and monitoring placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about its strategy for engaging with practice placement providers to ensure that an appropriate number and range of placements are available to students.

Reason: As noted from the separate condition against SET 5.2, the visitors sought clarification about the setting of placements for the programme and how the education provider would ensure that there would be an appropriate range of placements to support students to achieve all the learning outcomes. The visitors

met colleagues from one placement provider and, although noting the close collaboration between that provider and the education provider, were unable to gauge the effectiveness of the collaboration with other placement providers, or whether there would be sufficient providers to offer an appropriate number and range of placements. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further information about its strategy for engaging with placement providers to ensure that an appropriate number and range of placements are available to students.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to show how the assessment strategy and design ensures that a student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for clinical and forensic psychologists.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included a programme specification and a programme handbook, which included module descriptions, together with mapping documents showing how the SETs and SOPs were met. The programme is innovative as it is designed to cover the SOPs for both clinical and forensic psychologists. However, as indicated in the condition set against SET 3.8, discussions with the programme team indicated an intention to deliver the programme over four years of full time study instead of the two years of full study plus two years of part time study originally intended. The visitors noted that this change would inevitably lead to some restructuring of the programme and the way it was delivered and assessed, which would need to be reflected in the programme documentation. The visitors therefore require the education provider to review the programme documentation, in the light of the intention to deliver the programme over four years of full time study, to show how the assessment strategy and design ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for clinical and forensic psychologists. The visitors consider the condition under SET 4.1 and 5.2 to link with this condition.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to ensure that any exit award contains no reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register.

Reason: The SETs mapping document submitted by the education provider included reference to a Masters in Clinical Psychology that could be awarded to a student who failed the research component of the programme but met all other course requirements. There was no reference to this award in the programme regulations, although there was reference to an aegrotat award and the programme handbook made reference to the award of a “lesser degree” in certain circumstances. In discussions, the programme team confirmed that such

exit awards were available in the existing Clinical Psychology Doctorate (ClinPsyD) and Doctorate in Forensic Psychology Practice (ForenPsyD) programmes, but that these awards did not include reference to a protected title. The visitors therefore require the education provider to review the programme documentation to ensure that any exit award contains no reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors wished to encourage the education provider to keep the level of administrative support under review to ensure that there is sufficient support available for the effective delivery of the programme.

Reason: The visitors were content that this standard was met. They noted that there was to be a small increase in the level of administrative support available and that this would be reviewed as the number of students increased. The visitors welcomed the increase in administrative staff and, given the importance of administrative staff in supporting students on the programme, particularly in relation to placements, wished to encourage the education provider to monitor the level of administrative support actively to ensure that there continues to be sufficient administrative support to deliver the programme effectively.

George Delafield
Laura Golding

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Edinburgh
Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Clinical psychologist
Date of visit	7 – 8 June 2012

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. 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 23 July 2012 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 23 August 2012. 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 31 August 2012. 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 11 October 2012.

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 visit also considered a different programme, Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol) - flexible. 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	Stephen Davies (Clinical psychologist) Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Victoria Adenugba
Proposed student numbers	40 per cohort
First approved intake	January 1995
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Richard Williams (University of Edinburgh)
Secretary	Emily Gribbin (University of Edinburgh)
Members of the joint panel	Helen Dent (British Psychological Society) Rob Jones (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society) Gundi Kiemle (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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

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

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

The visitors 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.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must put in place a robust system for monitoring trainee attendance and ensure that attendance is communicated between placements providers and the programme team.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that attendance was monitored using spot checks. During discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that no formal record of attendance was maintained but during the trainee's annual review, attendance issues would be discussed. The visitors learnt that this was due to the programme team placing a level of responsibility on trainees to attend all teaching days as it is part of their contract. The visitors also learnt that there were plans to provide a register before each lecture, however this had not happened. During discussions with placement providers the visitors learnt that attendance was monitored at placement by a weekly sign off by supervisors' and that any absence had to be accounted for by trainees by contacting their line manager and supervisor. The visitors also learnt that there is a communication policy in place which stipulated that absences should be communicated between placement providers and the programme team. However some placement providers were unaware of such policy and had concerns that they were not being updated about their trainee's absence from lectures. The visitors were concerned that without a robust system in place to regularly monitor the attendance of trainees the programme team would not be able to take follow-up actions as soon as a trainee's attendance starts to slip. They were also concerned that visiting lecturers would not be able to identify which trainees had missed their lecture and would not be able to pass this information on to the programme team. To ensure this standard is being met the visitors require a robust mechanism be put in place to monitor trainee's attendance in all programme settings to ensure that absences are communicated between placement providers and the programme team.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider including admission information regarding the 'Protecting Vulnerable Groups' (PVG) checks, health requirement checks and the required International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score on their website.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met as admissions information is clearly highlighted on the Clearing House website which applicants read before applying, and a weblink is provided on the education provider's website. However to further ensure all applicants receive this information the programme team may want to consider adding information regarding the 'Protecting Vulnerable Groups' (PVG) checks, health requirement checks and the required International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score on their website .

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider increasing the opportunities for peer observation and review for both the academic staff and visiting lecturers.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met as a review of the curriculum vitae's supplied as part of the documentation for this visit showed that staff had the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. The visitors also learnt that there was a strong staff development and appraisal system in place, as well as a strong feedback system which trainees use to comment on teaching sessions. It was also noted that most teaching sessions are facilitated by two members of staff. However the visitors also learnt that the programme team does not frequently peer review and observe teaching sessions for both academic staff and visiting lecturers. To further enhance the learning experience of trainees and the academic staff the visitors suggest the programme team increase their use of the peer observation.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider indexing or referencing all versions of the programme handbook and notify trainees of any changes to the handbook.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met as the programme handbook had the relevant information a trainee would need whilst studying on this programme. However to make the handbook more user-friendly the visitors suggest that an index or referencing system be included within the handbook. During discussions with trainees the visitors also learnt that trainees

are only made aware of changes to the handbook when they need to access particular information. Trainees expressed frustration as it means a search can be time consuming and sometimes unsuccessful. The visitors therefore suggest that the education provider introduces an index or referencing system and notify trainees of changes to the handbook.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider clearly articulate to trainees who the relevant contact is for different types of queries or concerns.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met as from a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted within the trainee handbook that trainees are given information on the relevant points of contact for different types of queries or concerns. However during discussions with trainees the visitors learnt that they were still unclear on whom to contact if they had queries or concerns. The visitors learnt that trainees frequently contacted a particular member of the team that they were familiar with and as a result sometimes queries or concerns could end up being passed on several times until it reached the correct member of the team. Trainees also stated that they found it very hard to consult their handbook to access this information as it was hard to follow because it is not indexed or referenced. The visitors therefore suggest that the programme team reviews the current information in place to ensure all trainees are aware of the different types of support available to them and who to contact for different concerns.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider clearly articulating to trainees the location of the complaints process.

Reason: The visitors were content that this standard was met as there is a complaint process in place. However during discussions with the trainees the visitor learnt that some were unsure if there was such a process whilst others were aware that there must be a complaints process and that it is most likely to be within their handbook but as the handbook is so large and not indexed or referenced they were unsure of its location. The visitors learnt from trainees that they would bring up any complaint with a trusted member of staff if the need ever arose. To make trainees aware of the complaints process the visitors suggest that the programme team clearly sign posts trainees to it by indexing or referencing the programme handbook.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider mapping programme assessments to the academic leaning outcomes to highlight where assessments take place and which learning outcomes are covered within the assessments.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met as the learning outcomes in place ensure that students who successfully complete the

programme meet the standards of proficiency and are able to practise safely and effectively. From reviewing the documentation provided the visitors were able to find information about how the assessment methods employed measure the learning outcomes but noted that this information was not clearly mapped and was not straightforward to follow. To provide clarity to trainees the visitors suggest the programme team should consider mapping programme assessments to the academic learning outcomes to highlight where assessments take place and which learning outcomes are covered within the assessments.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider assessing and monitoring a trainee's progression between case conceptualisation 1 and 2.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met as assessment regulations are in place which clearly specify the requirements for a trainee's progression and achievement within the programme. However the visitors learnt that the difference between case conceptualisation in year 1 and year 2 is the subject area, which is different in year 1 from year 2. The visitors also noted that trainee's progression in case conceptualisation 1 and 2 was not assessed. The visitors recommend that the programme team may want to assess case conceptualisation in year 2 against year 1. This way trainees as well as the programme team would be able to see their development from a first year to a second year trainee and if there was a regression this could be acted upon.

Stephen Davies
Lynn Dunwoody

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Edinburgh
Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Clinical psychologist
Date of visit	7 – 8 June 2012

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. 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 23 July 2012 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 23 August 2012. 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 31 August 2012. 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 11 October 2012.

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 visit also considered a different programme, Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol) - full time. 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	Stephen Davies (Clinical psychologist) Lynn Dunwoody (Health psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Victoria Adenugba
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort
First approved intake	January 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Richard Williams (University of Edinburgh)
Secretary	Emily Gribbin (University of Edinburgh)
Members of the joint panel	Helen Dent (British Psychological Society) Rob Jones (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society) Gundi Kiemle (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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

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

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

The visitors 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.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must put in place a robust system for monitoring trainee attendance and ensure that attendance is communicated between placements providers and the programme team.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that attendance was monitored using spot checks. During discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that no formal record of attendance was maintained but during the trainee's annual review, attendance issues would be discussed. The visitors learnt that this was due to the programme team placing a level of responsibility on trainees to attend all teaching days as it is part of their contract. The visitors also learnt that there were plans to provide a register before each lecture, however this had not happened. During discussions with placement providers the visitors learnt that attendance was monitored at placement by a weekly sign off by supervisors' and that any absence had to be accounted for by trainees by contacting their line manager and supervisor. The visitors also learnt that there is a communication policy in place which stipulated that absences should be communicated between placement providers and the programme team. However some placement providers were unaware of such policy and had concerns that they were not being updated about their trainee's absence from lectures. The visitors were concerned that without a robust system in place to regularly monitor the attendance of trainees the programme team would not be able to take follow-up actions as soon as a trainee's attendance starts to slip. They were also concerned that visiting lecturers would not be able to identify which trainees had missed their lecture and would not be able to pass this information on to the programme team. To ensure this standard is being met the visitors require a robust mechanism be put in place to monitor trainee's attendance in all programme settings to ensure that absences are communicated between placement providers and the programme team.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider including admission information regarding the 'Protecting Vulnerable Groups' (PVG) checks, health requirement checks and the required International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score on their website.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met as admissions information is clearly highlighted on the Clearing House website which applicants read before applying, and a weblink is provided on the education provider's website. However to further ensure all applicants receive this information the programme team may want to consider adding information regarding the 'Protecting Vulnerable Groups' (PVG) checks, health requirement checks and the required International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score on their website .

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider increasing the opportunities for peer observation and review for both the academic staff and visiting lecturers.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met as a review of the curriculum vitae's supplied as part of the documentation for this visit showed that staff had the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. The visitors also learnt that there was a strong staff development and appraisal system in place, as well as a strong feedback system which trainees use to comment on teaching sessions. It was also noted that most teaching sessions are facilitated by two members of staff. However the visitors also learnt that the programme team does not frequently peer review and observe teaching sessions for both academic staff and visiting lecturers. To further enhance the learning experience of trainees and the academic staff the visitors suggest the programme team increase their use of the peer observation.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider indexing or referencing all versions of the programme handbook and notify trainees of any changes to the handbook.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met as the programme handbook had the relevant information a trainee would need whilst studying on this programme. However to make the handbook more user-friendly the visitors suggest that an index or referencing system be included within the handbook. During discussions with trainees the visitors also learnt that trainees

are only made aware of changes to the handbook when they need to access particular information. Trainees expressed frustration as it means a search can be time consuming and sometimes unsuccessful. The visitors therefore suggest that the education provider introduces an index or referencing system and notify trainees of changes to the handbook.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider clearly articulate to trainees who the relevant contact is for different types of queries or concerns.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met as from a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted within the trainee handbook that trainees are given information on the relevant points of contact for different types of queries or concerns. However during discussions with trainees the visitors learnt that they were still unclear on whom to contact if they had queries or concerns. The visitors learnt that trainees frequently contacted a particular member of the team that they were familiar with and as a result sometimes queries or concerns could end up being passed on several times until it reached the correct member of the team. Trainees also stated that they found it very hard to consult their handbook to access this information as it was hard to follow because it is not indexed or referenced. The visitors therefore suggest that the programme team reviews the current information in place to ensure all trainees are aware of the different types of support available to them and who to contact for different concerns.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider clearly articulating to trainees the location of the complaints process.

Reason: The visitors were content that this standard was met as there is a complaint process in place. However during discussions with the trainees the visitor learnt that some were unsure if there was such a process whilst others were aware that there must be a complaints process and that it is most likely to be within their handbook but as the handbook is so large and not indexed or referenced they were unsure of its location. The visitors learnt from trainees that they would bring up any complaint with a trusted member of staff if the need ever arose. To make trainees aware of the complaints process the visitors suggest that the programme team clearly sign posts trainees to it by indexing or referencing the programme handbook.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider mapping programme assessments to the academic leaning outcomes to highlight where assessments take place and which learning outcomes are covered within the assessments.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met as the learning outcomes in place ensure that students who successfully complete the

programme meet the standards of proficiency and are able to practise safely and effectively. From reviewing the documentation provided the visitors were able to find information about how the assessment methods employed measure the learning outcomes but noted that this information was not clearly mapped and was not straightforward to follow. To provide clarity to trainees the visitors suggest the programme team should consider mapping programme assessments to the academic learning outcomes to highlight where assessments take place and which learning outcomes are covered within the assessments.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider assessing and monitoring a trainee's progression between case conceptualisation 1 and 2.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met as assessment regulations are in place which clearly specify the requirements for a trainee's progression and achievement within the programme. However the visitors learnt that the difference between case conceptualisation in year 1 and year 2 is the subject area, which is different in year 1 from year 2. The visitors also noted that trainee's progression in case conceptualisation 1 and 2 was not assessed. The visitors recommend that the programme team may want to assess case conceptualisation in year 2 against year 1. This way trainees as well as the programme team would be able to see their development from a first year to a second year trainee and if there was a regression this could be acted upon.

Stephen Davies
Lynn Dunwoody

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Glasgow
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	19 – 20 June 2012

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 3 August 2012 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 23 August 2012. 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 28 September 2012. 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 4 December 2012.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Stephen Fisher (Occupational psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	David Christopher
Proposed student numbers	23 per cohort once a year
First approved intake	January 1995
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Massimo Pignatelli (University of Glasgow)
Secretary	Laura Baggley (19 June 2012) (University of Glasgow) Lindsey Coulter (20 June 2012) (University of Glasgow)
Members of the joint panel	Mark Forshaw (British Psychological Society) Geraldine Kavanagh (British Psychological Society) Margo Onanaiye (British Psychological Society) Mary O'Reilly (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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
Joint HPC approval and British Psychological Society accreditation event appendices	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review a practice placement handbook as a separate practice placement handbook has not been produced. Information relating to placements is included in the programme handbook.

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revise advertising materials for the programme, including the website, to ensure applicants are provided with clear information about the aligned training pathways and the implications of choosing to follow one of these pathways.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted by the education provider included information about aligned training pathways. These are defined pathways designed to provide students with increasing experience within a defined clinical population, for example older adults, children and child and adolescent mental health. The pathways are intended to meet workforce needs in priority areas. The programme team have designed the programme and the practice placements to ensure that the learning outcomes encompass all the standards of proficiency as well as give students experience within a defined clinical population. Applicants are invited to agree to follow one of these pathways during the application process. However, in discussions with students, it was clear that applicants did always not fully understand the aligned pathways or the implications of choosing to follow such a pathway. The visitors noted in discussions with the programme team that, although students were informed about the aligned pathways through correspondence and in discussions during the admissions procedures, information about the aligned pathways was not included on the programme's website. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise advertising materials for the programme, including the website, to include information about aligned pathways and the implications of choosing to follow such a pathway, so that applicants have all the information they need in order to make informed choices about the aligned pathways.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about how it monitors the processes for providing feedback to students on assessments to ensure that feedback is timely, consistent and sufficiently detailed to inform their learning and performance.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation provided (Annual Monitoring Report Session 2010-11) included reference to student concerns about the time taken to mark and return work submitted for summative assessment. The education provider attempts to turn around marking within 6-8 weeks. Concerns were raised in discussion with students, particularly amongst Year 1 students, about the length of time that it took for marks to be returned and how the level of detail provided was not always sufficient to help a student understand how performance could be improved. In addition, in some cases, where work had

been double marked, students received inconsistent feedback from markers, which was confusing and unhelpful.

In discussion with the programme team a number of factors were highlighted that impacted upon the delivery of feedback to students. The programme team sought to take account of students' wishes and, in some instances, had delayed feedback on assessments so that it could be delivered to the entire cohort at an agreed time. There were also conflicting priorities and, on occasion, priority had been given to conducting final year viva voce examinations over marking assessments for other years. However, the programme team sought to keep students informed of any delays in returning assessed work. In regards to consistency of marking there were objective marking criteria and standards were moderated by the external examiner. The examinations officer sought to ensure consistency of feedback and detail within assessments, and pointed out that students could ask to review marked work and discuss it with markers if they were unclear about how improvements could be achieved. Nevertheless, despite the steps outlined by the education provider, the visitors remained uncertain whether the education provider had a strategy in place for monitoring feedback on assessments that would identify and address the concerns raised by students. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further information about how it monitors the processes for providing feedback to students to make sure that students receive assessment feedback, which is timely, sufficiently detailed and consistent, to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise programme documentation to clearly state the requirement for at least one external examiner for the programme to be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the criteria for the appointment of external examiners for the programme. The education provider provided evidence that the current external examiner is registered with the HPC. The visitors were therefore satisfied that there is a system of external examiners in place and were content with the current external examiner for the programme. However, in order to be assured this standard is met visitors need to see the programme documentation refer to the requirement that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider consider revising programme documentation relating to the aligned training pathways to make clear that any reference to four or five year training plans relates to students following such pathways provided by another education provider involved in this initiative.

Reason: The visitors noted programme documentation submitted prior to the visit included reference to four or five year training plans for students following some of the aligned training pathways. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted the aligned pathways were part of a nationwide initiative and references to four and five year training plans were not relevant to this programme, but referred to a programme offered by another education provider involved in the initiative. To avoid any confusion for the students, the visitors suggest it would be helpful if the documentation was revised to make it clear that the four to five year training plans referred to were not applicable to them.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider continue to develop and augment IT facilities to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme for all students.

Reason: The visitors noted that students undertaking the programme with NHS Highlands were unable to attend all taught sessions and, consequently, a number of sessions were run via video conference. The practice placement providers and educators whom the visitors met confirmed that they had experience of this system. However, although discussions with the programme team revealed that the system worked well generally, the education provider was aware of its limitations and was in the process of tendering for a more robust solution for the next academic year. The visitors welcomed this information and wished to encourage the education provider in its efforts to ensure that the IT facilities support the required teaching activities of the programme for all students.

Ruth Baker
Stephen Fisher

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
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	17 - 18 May 2012

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. 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 29 June 2012 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 23 August 2012. 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 10 August 2012. 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 11 October 2012.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Annie Mitchell (Clinical psychologist) Julie Harrower (Forensic psychologist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Victoria Adenugba
Proposed student numbers	17
First approved intake	January 2000
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Keith Pinn (University of Hertfordshire)
Secretary	Nicola Bates (University of Hertfordshire) Wendy Figgs (University of Hertfordshire)
Members of the joint panel	Andrew Vidgen (British Psychological Society) Eve Knight (British Psychological Society) Jan Burns (British Psychological Society) Molly Ross (British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 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.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the fitness to practice policies are clearly articulated within the supervisor and trainee handbooks.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that the education provider's fitness to practice policy was not included within the trainee or supervisor handbooks. In discussion with the programme team it was made clear that there are two processes in place which deal with concerns about students' profession-related conduct at placement as well as at the education provider's site. The visitors were provided with both the education provider's and the NHS trust's fitness to practice policies. However the visitors were subsequently unclear about how the education provider's procedure to deal with concerns about students' profession-related conduct worked in relation to the NHS trust policy and how students and supervisors are made aware of this. The visitors therefore require the trainee and supervisors' handbooks be updated to detail the process in place which deals with concerns about students' profession-related conduct, to include clarification on the connection between the NHS trust policy and the education provider's policy.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: In discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that currently trainees are taught about the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics during their third year. The programme team also mentioned that this would now be taught during the first year. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted references to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics publication within the student handbook. However they were unable to find evidence to outline where HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were referred to in the curriculum and how the education provider ensures that students understand these standards, including how and where they apply. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to identify how the programme team ensure that students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics before they embark on their first placement.

Recommendations

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team look at how they communicate their accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (APEL) policy.

Reason: The visitors were content that this standard was met as APEL is not considered on this programme and this is stated within the programme handbook. The visitors would like the education provider to consider making this information known at the point of application; therefore the visitors suggest that this information should also be presented within the education provider's clearing house website.

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team look at how they ensure that classrooms are big enough for teaching, including space for break out rooms.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that the current rooms used by the programme would be involved in the centralised booking system for rooms across the education provider's site. The visitors are happy this standard is met as the current rooms have enough space to accommodate the number of trainees on this programme and trainees do not spend all their time within the education provider's site. The visitors would like the programme team to consider their timetable in advance to make sure that room bookings are made in a timely manner and take into account classroom size and the need for break out rooms for trainees for small group work during teaching .

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team explore more ways of incorporating shared learning with other pre-qualification professionals.

Reason: During discussions with the trainees and programme team the visitors learnt that whilst currently there are no shared learning components in the programme, at placements trainees usually work as part of a multi-disciplinary team. The visitors suggest the programme team to explore more ways of incorporating shared learning to further enhance trainee's knowledge and understanding of the roles and expectations of other professionals health and social care provision.

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team design a strategy to enable more active engagement with service users.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that there currently was no budget within this programme for service users. Despite the lack of budget they learnt that the programme team wanted to increase the use of service users within this programme. During discussions with trainees the visitors learnt that they have had a few service users participate in their learning and that this was greatly appreciated. The visitors also learnt that trainees had been asked to develop a service user database. To enhance trainee's learning about the rights and needs of service users the visitors suggest that the programme team find ways of increasing their participation within the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team consider further strengthening of their relationship with their external examiners and monitoring of their report response times.

Reason: The visitors were content that this standard was met. However during a review of the documentation submitted prior to the visit the visitors noticed that there had been a delayed response to an external examiner concerns. During discussion with the team the visitors learnt that the delay in response was due to the nature of the concern which the team wanted to respond to appropriately. The visitors learnt that the concern had now been addressed and the relationship between the team and external examiner restored. To ensure that future relations between the programme team and external examiners remain strong and effective the visitors suggest that the programme team continue to work with the external examiners and respond to their reports in a timely manner.

Annie Mitchell
Julie Harrower

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Nottingham
Programme name	Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology (D.App.Ed.Psy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Educational psychologist
Date of visit	16 – 17 May 2012

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 28 June 2012 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 23 August 2012. 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 28 September 2012. 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 4 December 2012.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Judith Bamford (Educational psychologist) Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	David Christopher
Proposed student numbers	12 per cohort once a year
First approved intake	January 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Alan Sunderland – 16 May 2012 (University of Nottingham) Eamon Ferguson – 17 May 2012 (University of Nottingham)
Secretary	Viv Kirk (University of Nottingham)
Members of the joint panel	Tara Midgen (British Psychological Society) Rupal Nathwani (British Psychological Society) Richard Parker (British Psychological Society) Graham Pratt (British Psychological Society) Anna Price (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"/>
Joint HPC approval and British Psychological Society accreditation event appendices	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

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

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

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

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 review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HPC.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider and information contained on its website included references to the programme which do not comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. The education provider's website stated that the programme 'leads to eligibility for registration with the HPC'. The programme specification stated that the course aims 'to enable' registration with the HPC. Such statements imply an automatic link between completing the programme successfully and registration with the HPC which is misleading. Successful completion of an approved programme confers eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials and its website, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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

Condition: The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that the postgraduate diploma and certificate exit awards do not confer eligibility to apply for HPC registration.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit made no explicit reference to an aegrotat award. However, the documentation indicated that students who failed the doctorate could be eligible to be awarded a postgraduate diploma or a certificate, depending on the number of credits achieved. In discussions, the programme team stated students were informed that these awards did not confer eligibility to apply for HPC registration. However, the programme documentation did not contain a clear statement to this effect, which could lead to a misunderstanding about the status of these exit awards. The visitors therefore require the education provider to include a clear statement in the programme documentation that the postgraduate diploma and certificate exit awards do not confer eligibility to apply for HPC registration to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revising the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to make clear to potential applicants that the programme does not accredit prior (experiential) learning.

Reason: The visitors noted that programme documentation submitted prior to the visit made no reference to a scheme for accrediting prior (experiential) learning, although the education provider's institution-wide procedures allow programmes to operate such mechanisms. However, discussions with the programme team revealed that there was no such scheme in place for this programme. The visitors noted that it would be helpful to potential applicants if the absence of such a scheme was made clear. The visitors suggest that the education provider give consideration to revising the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to make clear to potential applicants that the programme does not accredit prior (experiential) learning.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to develop the on-line learning resources that are available to students.

Reason: The visitors noted that students were generally content with their access to learning resources such as lecture notes and presentations. The education provider had provided students with email access and there were a number of email distribution lists to facilitate the flow of information. The visitors noted that the education provider has decided to introduce a virtual learning environment called Moodle as a means of facilitating access to learning resources. The visitors saw a demonstration of this system for an undergraduate programme and noted that the programme would use this system from the next academic year. The visitors welcomed the intention to enhance the online learning resources available to students and wish to encourage the education provider in the development and introduction of this facility for the programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to develop the procedures for monitoring attendance at practice placement educator training.

Reason: The visitors were content that this standard continues to be met. They noted the training that was made available to practice placement educators and the close links that the education provider had forged with practice placement educators. The visitors also noted that attendance at training events was monitored and efforts made to ensure that those who were absent received

relevant information in another form, for example via email. The visitors welcomed the steps that have been taken to monitor attendance at training events and suggested that the education provider continue to develop its monitoring processes in order to facilitate the training of practice placement educators

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to ensure that information provided about the number of credits awarded is clear and consistent.

Reason: The visitors noted the education provider's regulations for the programme indicated that a total of 540 credits would be required for the award of a doctoral level qualification. However, the information setting out the number of credits awarded in the programme specification referred to 240 credits. The visitors noted that this lack of consistency was unhelpful and could confuse students about what was expected of them for progression and successful completion of the programme. The visitors therefore suggested that the education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to ensure that the information about credits is clear and consistent.

Judith Bamford
Robert Stratford

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Sheffield
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	16 – 17 May 2012

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 26 June 2012 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 23 August 2012. 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 7 September 2012. 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 4 December 2012.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) Nicola Bowes (Forensic psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	18
First approved intake	January 1990
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Alistair Warren (University of Sheffield)
Secretary	Sue Davison (University of Sheffield)
Members of the joint panel	Liz Anderson (British Psychological Society) Geraldine Kavanagh (British Psychological Society) Mary O'Reilly (British Psychological Society) Tom Patterson (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"/>
SET and SOP Appendices	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Annual feedback report and annual report November 2011	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme and admissions documentation to ensure it is consistent, reflective of current terminology used and gives all the information applicants require.

Reason: From a review of the programme and admissions documentation the visitors noted a number of instances where out of date terminology is used and where further clarifications should be added. In several places the criminal conviction checks required for admissions was referred to as “police checks” (Clearing house entry, SET and SOP appendices, appendix 2.1a) or “CRB (Criminal Records Bureau) Police Check” (Selection 2012 Administrative Details, SET and SOP appendices, appendix 2.1e). The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme and admissions documentation to clarify the criminal convictions check undertaken is an enhanced CRB (Criminal Records Bureau) check. The visitors additionally noted the programme team should be more pro-active in informing potential applicants of information surrounding the occupational health check processes in place, in particular the support available if anything is declared through the occupational health check. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit programme and admissions documentation to ensure it is consistent, reflective of current terminology used and gives all the information applicants require.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how they recruit external speakers; how they ensure external speakers have relevant specialist expertise and up to date knowledge; and how they guarantee the quality of their teaching.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors noted local NHS clinical psychologists are integral to the delivery of the curriculum as external speakers. The visitors noted ‘teaching feedback’ was submitted by students at the end of each speaker’s session. The visitors however, could not clearly determine what recruitment mechanisms were in place or how the programme team would ensure external speakers have the specialist expertise and relevant up to date knowledge to be able to ensure students would meet the relevant learning outcomes for the session. Additionally the visitors could not determine how the programme team guaranteed the quality of the external speakers’ teaching. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team recruits, guarantees and safeguards the quality of the teaching of the external speakers.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate how they ensure supervisors have undertaken appropriate initial training and undertake regular refresher training to work with students from this programme.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit provided some information as to the nature of the training undertaken by supervisors for this programme. It was indicated the programme undertakes a joint training programme (Supervisor Training and Recognition (STAR)) with two other clinical psychology programmes delivered in the area which has been agreed by the British Psychological Society (BPS) as a structure for all applied psychology supervision. The visitors were satisfied supervisors were being appropriately trained in supervision however could not determine how the programme team ensured that training on programme specific information was undertaken. The visitors could not determine whether programme specific training was a mandatory requirement before supervisors worked with students. The visitors could also not determine how the programme team ensured that initial and refresher training was being undertaken and so whether they were able to take steps to ensure appropriate training is undertaken by supervisors when necessary. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide further information to demonstrate how they ensure supervisors have undertaken appropriate initial training and undertake regular refresher training to work with students from this programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider create a programme specific equality and diversity strategy to help widen access to the programme as much as possible.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors noted evidence of equality and diversity policies in the admissions procedures and evidence of the monitoring of the policies. The visitors noted the programme came under the faculty's equality and diversity policies and is considered alongside the other programmes in the faculty. The visitors suggest the programme team consider formulating a programme specific equality and diversity strategy with long and short term actions, and with senior team input to ensure the work that is currently being undertaken around widening access to the programme is conducted in a way that is specific for the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider revisit the programme documentation to ensure there are no inaccuracies.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation submitted prior to the visit there were some slight inaccuracies in terminology which were not detrimental to the students learning however could create some confusion. For example, the Trainees' Information Pack (section 7, p30) refers to the HPC's Guidance on conduct and ethics for students as the "HPC Code of Conduct and Ethics for Students". The visitors suggest the programme team revisit the programme documentation to check and correct any inaccuracies.

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team consider giving supervisors and students' further guidance around attendance and annual leave.

Reason: Discussions with the students highlighted they found it difficult to use their annual leave entitlements through the year due to the timing requirements of the programme. Discussions with the supervisors highlighted there had been a few noted problems with students booking annual leave for during the duration of a placement. Due to the organisation schedule of placements the supervisor had planned the student's case load and then discovered the student had booked annual leave during the placement. This led to disruptions with the

organisation of the placement for the supervisor and the student. The visitors suggest the programme team consider if they can give further guidance around annual leave, and use the students and supervisors experiences to come up with an approach that is suitable for all parties and ensures minimal impact to placement arrangement.

Sabiha Azmi
Nicola Bowes

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Programme name	Practitioner Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DcounsPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Counselling psychologist
Date of visit	20 – 21 June 2012

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	12

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 30 July 2012 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 23 August 2012. 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 October 2012. 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 4 December 2012.

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 an HPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Tony Ward (Counselling and Health psychologist) George Delafield (Forensic and Occupational psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	18 per cohort
First approved intake	January 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Cathy Shaw (University of Wolverhampton)
Secretary	N/A

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"/>
Additional documents: Policy documents, advertising materials, placement documentation and programme committee minutes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how practice placements are effectively managed

Reason: Documentation provided and discussion at the visit detailed the management of practice placements. Practice placements are organised through liaison with the placement supervisor. Students' have employee status with the practice placement provider through an honorary contract. Whilst at the practice placement the student will have a line manager and a placement supervisor who provides supervision, signs the client logs and placement reports. Discussion with the placement supervisors indicated they were responsible for the students' placement however the line manager oversaw the placement and ensured the placement arrangements continued to be appropriate for both the student and the practice placement. The visitors were concerned the students' line managers were not directly involved in arranging the placement in the first instance. As the student is under an honorary contract the visitors judged it to be important they be part of the arrangements and be aware of the duties and responsibilities of all parties in order that the management of placements is effective. The visitors noted there was a contractual agreement signed by the supervisor, student and the programme team (Placement Supervisor's Handbook 2011-12, p21) which sets out the duties and responsibilities of the supervisor, the student and the programme team. The visitors suggest the programme team consider whether this can be extended to incorporate the students' line managers, or use a similar document, to ensure effective management of placement. The conditions in this report for SETs 5.3, 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 could be considered alongside this condition to ensure effective placement management. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how practice placements are effectively managed.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation to ensure terminology in use is accurate, reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation and includes references to the HPC, relevant standards and publications where appropriate.

Reason: Upon reviewing the programme documentation received before the visit, the visitors noted areas that had not been updated and were not reflective of the current landscape of regulation. In discussion the programme team highlighted the information available online through the virtual learning environment (WOLF) was continually updated and that the hardcopy documentation we had received had not been updated fully because it was not used often. In the documentation the visitors noted there was little mention of HPC in several areas where they expected to see it. Three modules in particular, PS4002, PS4044 and PS5001 contained direct reference to the BPS code of conduct in the module guides and descriptors however made no reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics or the HPC's Guidance on

conduct and ethics for students. The visitors also noted the documentation contained references to 'chartered counselling and clinical psychologists', this terminology is no longer in use, the terminology to be used is 'Registered'. Discussion at the visit indicated the programme is due to undergo revalidation within the next six months which will include amendments to programme documentation. The validation event will be reviewing this programme with an amended credit structure and amended modules. The programme in its current form will not be transferring to the new structures. As a resource to support student learning, the visitors will therefore require both the current and the amended programme to use revised programme documentation. The visitors require the programme team to update programme documentation to ensure it is accurate, reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation and includes references to the HPC, relevant standards and publications where appropriate.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure all practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included a form to collect placement details for the programme team. The form is completed by the student and asks for details of the placement location and contact, the named supervisor and their contact details. Discussion with the programme team indicated they used the form to initiate contact to assess the practice placement setting's suitability. It was highlighted that previously one member of the programme team had the role of being the main contact with responsibility for the approval and monitoring of the placements. Unfortunately the individual who had this role is no longer part of the programme team and as a result the programme team do not have full access to how this process was managed. The programme team are now working to formally document the processes used for the approval and monitoring of placements. The visitors judged there to be not enough evidence to show how the programme team ensures the placement settings are safe and supportive environments for students. There was no evidence of any risk assessments undertaken or how health and safety policies and procedures are checked at placement settings. The visitors were concerned there was no formal method for the programme team to maintain overall responsibility for the placements including ensuring the placement environments are safe and supportive for the students. The visitors suggest a method be incorporated into the initial placement arrangements and then ongoing monitoring systems. The conditions for SETs 3.2, 5.4, 5.5, and 5.6 can be looked at alongside this condition as they are closely linked. The visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure all practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included how the programme team approves placements. A form is used to record placement details. The form is completed by the student and records details of the placement location and contact, the named supervisor and their contact details. Discussion with the programme team indicated they used the form to initiate contact to assess the practice placement setting's suitability. It was highlighted that previously one member of the programme team had the role of being the main contact with responsibility for the approval and monitoring of the placements. Unfortunately the individual who had this role is no longer part of the programme team and as a result the programme team do not have full access to how this process was managed. The programme team are now working to formally document the processes used for the approval and monitoring of placements. The visitors did not have enough evidence to determine the approval and monitoring of placements is thorough and effective. The visitors commented that the programme team have a number of resources currently in place (initial placement details form, contractual agreement, placement reports and supervisor database) which could be improved to be of further use when approving and monitoring placements and satisfying the HPC SETs. The visitors suggest the programme team consider the conditions under SETs 3.2, 5.3, 5.5 and 5.6 to ensure effective placement approval and monitoring. The visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence to demonstrate how they maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure all practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included a form to collect placement details for the programme team. The form is completed by the student and asks for details of the placement location and contact, the named supervisor and their contact details. Discussion with the programme team indicated they used the form to initiate contact to assess the practice placement settings' suitability. It was highlighted that previously one member of the programme team had the role of being the main contact with responsibility for the approval and monitoring of the placements. Unfortunately the individual who had this role is no longer part of the programme team and as a result the programme team do not have full access to how this process was managed. The visitors judged there to be not enough evidence to show how the programme team ensures the placement providers will have equality and diversity policies in place. The programme team are now working to formally document the processes used for

the approval and monitoring of placements. The visitors suggest a method be incorporated into the initial placement arrangements and then ongoing monitoring systems. The conditions for SETs 3.2, 5.3, 5.4 and 5.6 can be looked at alongside this condition as they are closely linked. The visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure all practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included a form to collect placement details for the programme team. The form is completed by the student and asks for details of the placement location and contacts, the named supervisor and their contact details. Discussion with the programme team indicated they used the form to initiate contact and to assess the practice placement settings' suitability. It was highlighted that previously one member of the programme team had the role of being the main contact with responsibility for the approval and monitoring of the placements. Unfortunately the individual who had this role is no longer part of the programme team and as a result the programme team do not have full access to how this process was managed. The visitors judged there to be not enough evidence to show how the programme team ensures practice placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place. The programme team are now working to formally document the processes used for the approval and monitoring of placements. The visitors suggest a method be incorporated into the initial placement arrangements and then ongoing monitoring systems. The conditions for SETs 3.2, 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 can be looked at alongside this condition as they are closely linked. The visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure all practice placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure supervisors are appropriately trained prior to working with students and receive refresher training as appropriate.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated placement supervisors should have training in supervision (Placement Supervisor's Handbook, p17) and would have access to relevant programme information through the handbook, the virtual learning environment (WOLF) and had been recently invited to a placement supervisor workshop day. Discussion at the visit indicated these were new initiatives and the programme team are working to implement this as a more formal structure to placement supervisors training. It

was indicated the programme team expected supervisory training to be undertaken. It was discussed whether training could be mandatory however the programme team made it clear they considered this to be too difficult to enforce. The visitors considered training prior to working with students to be essential to ensure the student placement experience is appropriately managed by the placement supervisor and so they are trained appropriately for the role expected of them. They also considered ongoing refresher training to be necessary in order to keep the placement supervisor informed of updates and changes to the programme and to refresh their skills at working with students. The visitors are supportive of the new initiatives the programme team are implementing and suggest that training can be undertaken in a variety of ways if the placement supervisor is unable to attend a training day at the education provider. The Standards of education and training guidance document (SET 5.8) gives further information around how this can be done. In order to determine this standard is met the visitors require the programme team to demonstrate how they ensure placement supervisors are appropriately trained prior to working with students and receive 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 education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how placement supervisors are fully prepared for placement which includes understanding the learning outcomes to be achieved.

Reason: Discussion at the visit with the placement supervisors indicated it was the students who informed them of the learning outcomes for the programme, through the module guides which they took and discussed if necessary with the supervisor. The visitors were concerned that without the programme team disseminating this information, confusions could arise as to what the learning outcomes require. The education provider should maintain responsibility for ensuring placement supervisors are fully prepared for placements including understanding the learning outcomes to be achieved. Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team are currently implementing some new initiatives that will enable easier dissemination of programme information through training day workshops and through the virtual learning environment (WOLF). The visitors consider the condition under SET 5.8 to link with this condition as both of these conditions deal with the preparation of placement supervisors working with students from the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how placement supervisors are fully prepared for placement which includes understanding the learning outcomes to be achieved.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that exit awards for this programme do not contain any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Reason: Documentation provided indicated there are two interim awards available for students who leave the programme before completion. The interim awards were MSc Counselling Psychology and Post-MSc Counselling Psychology. These two interim awards clearly make reference to the Counselling Psychology part of the Register and therefore the visitors are unable to consider this standard as being met. The visitors require the programme team to rename these two awards to ensure they do not make any reference to an HPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

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 visitors recommend the education provider consider expanding the information provided initially in the advertising materials for the programme.

Reason: The visitors have reviewed the advertising materials (website page and course leaflet) and are satisfied an applicant to the programme would have enough information in order to make an informed choice. The visitors did however feel further information could be included to have greater transparency of the admissions procedures. Firstly, the visitors noted the current information requests applicants to have had 'normally' "at least six months in relevant paid or voluntary work, using appropriate skills with clients on a one-to-one basis" (programme website). The visitors queried what 'non-normal' experience would be and how applicants would know what this meant. The students indicated that upon asking the programme team for further information about this they received what they needed. The visitors feel if further clarifications of this were provided in the first instance it could reduce the amount of queries the programme team would receive. Secondly, the visitors noted the programme is subject to the education provider accreditation of prior learning (APL) policies. Discussion indicated that although applications for APL are allowed it is very difficult to apply APL due to the nature of the programme. The visitors felt this information could be communicated for applicants so they have a better knowledge and understanding of the admissions processes.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team ensure they consult thoroughly with students who decide to narrow the range of client groups they work with at their placement.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated students arranged their own placements in the second and third years with guidance from the programme team if required. The visitors were satisfied that the programme team could assure themselves the placements would support the achievement of the learning outcomes and so were confident students could choose an appropriate range of placements themselves. The visitors noted through discussion examples of students who had narrowed the range of client groups they worked with in their placements because they had decided on defined career paths to follow once in practice. The visitors were satisfied the programme would ensure these students would be able to meet all the standards of proficiency and practise in a safe and effective way. However they were aware that by narrowing the range of client groups, students could be restricting their scope of practice in the future. The visitors recommend the programme team ensure they discuss thoroughly the implications of this with any student wishing to do so and consider taking further

responsibility of arranging suitable placements to ensure students will be able to meet all the learning outcomes for the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team continue to strengthen regular and effective collaboration between themselves, the placement providers and the placement supervisors.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team are in the process of implementing new initiatives to strengthen collaboration between the practice placement providers, practice supervisors and themselves. These initiatives include granting honorary membership of the education provider for library access, access to training courses and continuing professional development programmes, access to the virtual learning resources (WOLF) and more formal structured regular meetings with the practice placement providers and practice supervisors. In discussion with the placement supervisors it was made clear that they appreciated these new initiatives and all would welcome further collaboration and more formal links to the programme. The visitors were pleased to hear this and wish to encourage the programme team to continue with implementing initiatives such as these. The visitors also wished to highlight to the programme team that the placement supervisors voiced how they would welcome more formal links with the programme and noted that this could be conducive to meeting several conditions in this report.

Tony Ward
George Delafield