![hpc health professions council]

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Exeter
Programme name	Educational, Child and Community Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Educational psychologist
Date of visit	3 – 4 May 2012

Contents

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. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 23 August 2012. At the Committee meeting on 23 August 2012, the ongoing approval of the programme was re-confirmed. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

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)
	Peter Branston (Educational psychologist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	David Christopher
Proposed student numbers	5 per cohort once a year
First approved intake	January 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Rupert Wegerif (University of Exeter)
Secretary	Jenny Andrews (University of Exeter)
Members of the joint panel	Sandra Dunsmuir (British Psychological Society)
	Julia Hardy (British Psychological Society)
	Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society)
	Rupal Nathwani (British Psychological Society)
	Merkel Sender (British Psychological Society)
	Dilanthi Weerasinghe (British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐
Student written feedback on the programme	☒	☐	☐
Details of practice placement educators and attendance at training events	☒	☐	☐

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

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

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 programme does not offer an aegrotat award.

Reason: The visitors noted that the SETs mapping document provided prior to the visit stated that the programme does not offer an aegrotat award. However, the programme documentation did not make any reference to this fact. The visitors noted that this was potentially confusing to applicants and students and could lead to the mistaken belief that an aegrotat award was available and provided eligibility for admission to the Register. The visitors therefore require the education provider to include a clear statement in the programme documentation that the programme does not offer an aegrotat award to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to include a clear statement 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 about the appointment of external examiners for the programme. The education provider had provided external examiner reports and evidence that the current external examiner was registered with the HPC. The visitors were satisfied that there was a system of external examiners in place and were content with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that the HPC requirements regarding the external examiner for the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate 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 the SETs mapping document submitted prior to the visit stated that the programme does not have a scheme for accrediting prior (experiential) learning. However, the programme documentation and advertising materials did not make this clear. 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.

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 the training events provided were not always well attended. However, 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.

Judith Bamford
Peter Branston