

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Birmingham
Programme name	Applied Educational and Child Psychology (D.Ed.Psy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Educational psychologist
Date of visit	29-30 April 2010

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or '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 10 June 2010 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 7 July 2010. 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 24 June 2010. 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 26 August 2010.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Trevor Holme (Educational psychologist) Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Brendon Edmonds
Proposed student numbers	12
Initial approval	1 January 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	David Stephenson (University of Birmingham)
Secretary	Beverley Burke (University of Birmingham)
Members of the joint panel	Jackie Lown (The British Psychological Society) Julia Hardy (The British Psychological Society) Pat Bennett (The British Psychological Society) Rupal Nathwani (The 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 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 SETs.

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme.

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 resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that the successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply to the HPC register.

Reason: The visitors noted the programme documentation contained little reference to the role of the HPC. In particular the visitors noted the programme documentation did not advise applicants or potential applicants that the successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply to the HPC register as an Educational psychologist.

The visitors considered the absence of this information could be potentially misleading to applicants or potential applicants to the programme. The visitors require the programme documentation be redrafted to include, where appropriate, information addressing the requirements of this condition.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to more clearly articulate the standard English requirements applied as part of the admissions process.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and through meeting with the programme team, standard English requirements were applied as part of the admissions process. In particular, the documentation specified any applicant must evidence a level of English 'significantly in excess of standard English requirements'. The visitors were unclear as to the level of English an applicant was required to meet to be admitted to the programme.

The visitors consider the lack of clarity regarding the level of English to be demonstrated by applicants upon admission to the programme to be potentially misleading. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation to clearly articulate the standard of English required to be demonstrated by applicants when applying to the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to clearly articulate the health requirements which are applied prior to admission to the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation the absence of any clear health requirements to be met for applicants being admitted to the programme, other than university wide regulations. In the meeting with the programme team, the visitors noted the admissions process requires applicants to complete a health declaration. The visitors were not provided with a process which considers how any health issues raised through the completion of a declaration are dealt with.

The visitors were not satisfied the health requirements and process for dealing with any issues were clearly articulated within the programme documentation for potential applicants to the programme. The visitors require the programme documentation be reviewed to clearly articulate the requirement for applicants to complete a health check. Furthermore, any information should also clearly advise applicants of how any issues identified in the health declaration are dealt with as part of the admissions process.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to clearly articulate the criteria applicants must meet to be granted accreditation of prior learning (APEL) upon admission to the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation the absence of any clear APEL policy applicable to the programme, other than university wide regulations. However, in the meeting with the programme team, the visitors noted there were specific circumstances under which APEL may be granted to an applicant to the programme.

The visitors consider the absence of this information within the programme documentation could be potentially misleading to applicants. The visitors require the education provider redraft the programme documentation to clearly articulate the criteria applicants must meet to be granted accreditation of prior learning (APEL) upon admission to the programme

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft the programme documentation to clearly articulate the process for gaining informed consent from students, including a mechanism used to formally record this.

Reason: Through the documentation and various meetings at the visit, the visitors noted students were required to participate as service users in practical and clinical sessions on the programme. The programme team acknowledged there was no documented or formalised process for gaining informed consent from students. However the programme team advised that students are made aware of the requirement to participate as a service user at the beginning of the programme and before any practical session.

The visitors considered the lack of information outlining the expectations for participation, and the need for obtaining informed consent, could be potentially misleading to students. Furthermore, the visitors considered the current system did include appropriate protocols to ensure a formal record of informed consent was obtained from each student. Therefore the visitors require the education provider redraft the programme documentation to clearly articulate the clearly articulate the process for gaining informed consent from students, including a mechanism used to formally record this.

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 redraft the 'Psychology in Professional Practice' module handbook to make reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The visitors noted in the 'Psychology in Professional Practice' module handbook, the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were not referred to as a source of information. The visitors consider the absence of this reference from the module did not provide students with the information needed to understand the implications of these standards on their professional practice.

In order to be satisfied this SET is met, the visitors require the module handbook be redrafted to include reference to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics as a source of information.

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 redraft the programme documentation to advise students and applicants no aegrotat award is available for the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted the programme documentation did not advise students or applicants that no aegrotat award was available for the programme. The programme team confirmed an aegrotat award was not available and acknowledged this was not stated within the documentation.

In order to be satisfied this SET is met, the visitors require the education provider redraft the programme documentation to clearly articulate no aegrotat award is available for the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider referencing the HPC's 'Guidance for health and character' and 'A disabled persons guide to becoming a health professional' in any system for conducting health checks during admissions.

Reason: The visitors noted the requirement for applicants to complete a health declaration as part of the admissions process for the programme. Furthermore the visitors also noted the documentation did not detail this requirement and the system used for managing any health issues raised. Accordingly the visitors placed a condition relating to this SET requiring the education provider to revise the programme documentation to articulate the system for conducting health checks.

To further assist the development of this system, the visitors recommend the education provider reference the HPC's 'Guidance for health and character' and 'A disabled persons guide to becoming a health professional' as a source of information.

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to more clearly articulate the programme is designed to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation the learning outcomes for the programme, where they were being delivered and how they related to the standards of proficiency. However, the visitors could find no information advising students and applicants of how the design of the programme ensures those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register

Although satisfied this SET is met, the visitors recommend the education provider review the programme documentation to more clearly articulate the link between the learning outcomes of the programme and the HPC standards of proficiency.

5.12 Learning, teaching and supervision must encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to enhance the awareness of the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics in relation to issues of professional conduct on placement.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation the implementation of a 'Code of Ethics' for students to adhere to whilst on the programme. This code has been developed using the HPC standards of conduct performance and ethics, and the BPS and AEP code of ethics. The visitors also noted the 'Psychology in Professional Practice' module handbook did not make reference to the HPC standards.

Although satisfied this SET is met, the visitors' recommend the education provider review the programme documentation to further enhance the awareness of the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics in relation to issues of professional conduct on placement.

Trevor Holme
Claire Brewis

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Programme name	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of visit	28 – 29 April 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Commendations	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 'Operating department practitioner must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 4 June 2010 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 7 July 2010. 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 May 2010. 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 26 August 2010.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Nick Clark (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	50 twice a year
Initial approval	September 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Nigel Simons (Edge Hill University)
Secretary	Susan Roper-Davies (Edge Hill University)
Members of the joint panel	Tim Lewis (Cardiff University, External Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
Transitional Arrangements document	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review the student handbook or the practice placement handbook prior to the visit as the documentation does not exist yet.

The HPC did not review External examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it. However, they did table it at the visit itself.

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 did not meet with the senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme as they were satisfied with the discussions that had already taken place and did not feel it was necessary to discuss the programme with them also.

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revise and resubmit programme documentation to ensure there is accuracy and clarity relating to references to the Health Professions Council.

Reason: In the documentation provided by the education provider prior to the visit there were instances of lack of accuracy and clarity when referring to the Health Professions Council. The online documentation for this programme had a misleading statement in that it claimed the programme led to successful students achieving “professional registration as an Operating Department Practitioner” rather than eligibility to apply to our register only. Additionally throughout the documentation there were typographical errors in the spelling of the ‘Health Professions Council’ and the ‘Standards of Proficiency’. This is inaccurate and confusing information. Therefore, in order to provide students with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme and to prevent confusion amongst students on the programme, the visitors require revised documentation to take account of these inaccuracies and to ensure the programme has the correct information available online.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise and resubmit programme documentation to clearly identify the minimum attendance requirements and the associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit did not clearly specify the minimum attendance requirements or the associated monitoring mechanisms in place. During discussions with the programme team it became clear that all modules were compulsory and there was an allowed absence of a maximum of 30 days over the three years. The visitors were satisfied the programme had identified the attendance requirements but not satisfied they would be fully communicated to the students and teaching team. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be revised to include the minimum attendance requirements and the associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

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 submit the revised module descriptors and revised programme documentation that clarifies which publication of the Standards of Proficiency are being used at which point.

Reason: The internal validation discussions at the visit from the external panel members' role included the approval of their modules. The modules were approved subject to amendments to the module descriptors. These resulted amendments were to include profession specific learning outcomes, the corrections of typographical errors and professional body inclusions. Additionally there were references in the programme documentation to the HPC standards of proficiency for both dates of publication – 2004 and 2009. The visitors were satisfied that the original module descriptors learning outcomes met the standards of proficiency for their part of the register. The documentary references to the standards of proficiency were confusing. The visitors require the education provider to resubmit the programmes module descriptors after the amendments have been made to ensure the learning outcomes continue to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the register. The visitors also require the education provider to resubmit programme documentation that has clarification on the version of the Standards of Proficiency that is being used.

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 submit the revised module descriptors.

Reason: The internal validation discussions at the visit from the external panel members' role included the approval of their modules. The modules were approved subject to amendments to the module descriptors. These resulted amendments were to include profession specific learning outcomes, the corrections of typographical errors and professional body inclusions. The visitors were satisfied that the assessment strategy and design of the original module descriptors learning outcomes met the standards of proficiency for their part of the register. The visitors require the education provider to resubmit the programmes module descriptors after the amendments have been made to ensure the assessments of the amended learning outcomes continue to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the register.

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 revise and resubmit programme documentation to include information regarding their aegrotat award policy.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit had no clear mention of any aegrotat award policies. Upon further discussions at the visit it became clear that the education provider did not use aegrotat awards for this programme. This information should be clearly communicated to students. For clarity for the

students the visitors require the programme documentation to be revised to clearly include this information.

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 and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the programme specific documentation submitted prior to the visit there was no mention of the arrangements for the post of external examiner for the programme. The education provider did submit documentation which related to the internal validation of all of the programmes being validated at the event. This documentation stated that for each profession there would be profession specific external examiners. The visitors were satisfied with this blanket statement but for clarity require the education provider to revise the programme specific documentation to include clear reference to this standard of education and training.

Commendations

The visitors wish to commend the following aspects of the programme:

Commendation: The visitors wish to commend the education provider's innovative design and implementation of the diverse profession programme portfolio of which this programme is part of.

Reason: The education provider has designed this programme to be a part of a major combined portfolio of programmes which share common inter-professional modules alongside the profession specific modules. The visitors considered the design of the three year programme to raise the recognition of the professional profile of operating department practitioners amongst all health practitioners and were impressed by the faculty and programme teams' dedication and enthusiasm to this inter-professional learning approach.

Nick Clark
Andrew Steel

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of visit	28 – 29 April 2010

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Commendations	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 'Operating department practitioner' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 4 June 2010 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 7 July 2010. 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 May 2010. 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 26 August 2010.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Nick Clark (Operating department practitioner)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	50 twice a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2010
Chair	Nigel Simons (Edge Hill University)
Secretary	Susan Roper-Davies (Edge Hill University)
Members of the joint panel	Tim Lewis (Cardiff University, External Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
Transitional Arrangements document	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC did not review the student handbook or the practice placement handbook prior to the visit as the documentation does not exist yet.

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

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

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

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

The HPC did not meet with the senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme as they were satisfied with the discussions that had already taken place and did not feel it was necessary to discuss the programme with them also.

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

The visitors have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revise and resubmit programme documentation to ensure there is accuracy and clarity relating to references to the Health Professions Council.

Reason: In the documentation provided by the education provider prior to the visit there were instances of lack of accuracy and clarity when referring to the Health Professions Council. At the time of the visit there was no information online accessible for potential students in regards to this new programme. The online documentation for the pre-existing programme had a misleading statement in that it claimed the programme led to successful students achieving “professional registration as an Operating Department Practitioner” rather than eligibility to apply to our register only. Additionally throughout the documentation there were typographical errors in the spelling of the ‘Health Professions Council’ and the ‘Standards of Proficiency’. This is inaccurate and confusing information. Therefore, in order to provide students with the correct information to make an informed choice about whether to join the programme and to prevent confusion amongst students on the programme, the visitors require revised documentation to take account of these inaccuracies and to ensure the new programme has the correct information available online.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise and resubmit programme documentation to clearly identify the minimum attendance requirements and the associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit did not clearly specify the minimum attendance requirements or the associated monitoring mechanisms in place. During discussions with the programme team it became clear that all modules were compulsory and there was an allowed absence of a maximum of 30 days over the three years. The visitors were satisfied the programme had identified the attendance requirements but not satisfied they would be fully communicated to the students and teaching team. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be revised to include the minimum attendance requirements and the associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

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 submit the revised module descriptors and revised programme documentation that clarifies which publication of the Standards of Proficiency are being used at which point.

Reason: The internal validation discussions at the visit from the external panel members' role included the approval of their modules. The modules were approved subject to amendments to the module descriptors. These resulted amendments were to include profession specific learning outcomes, the corrections of typographical errors and professional body inclusions. Additionally there were references in the programme documentation to the HPC standards of proficiency for both dates of publication – 2004 and 2009. The visitors were satisfied that the original module descriptors learning outcomes met the standards of proficiency for their part of the register. The documentary references to the standards of proficiency were confusing. The visitors require the education provider to resubmit the programmes module descriptors after the amendments have been made to ensure the learning outcomes continue to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the register. The visitors also require the education provider to resubmit programme documentation that has clarification on the version of the Standards of Proficiency that is being used.

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 submit the revised module descriptors.

Reason: The internal validation discussions at the visit from the external panel members' role included the approval of their modules. The modules were approved subject to amendments to the module descriptors. These resulted amendments were to include profession specific learning outcomes, the corrections of typographical errors and professional body inclusions. The visitors were satisfied that the assessment strategy and design of the original module descriptors learning outcomes met the standards of proficiency for their part of the register. The visitors require the education provider to resubmit the programmes module descriptors after the amendments have been made to ensure the assessments of the amended learning outcomes continue to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the register.

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 revise and resubmit programme documentation to include information regarding their aegrotat award policy.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit had no clear mention of any aegrotat award policies. Upon further discussions at the visit it became clear that the education provider did not use aegrotat awards for this programme. This

information should be communicated to students. For clarity for the students the visitors require the programme documentation to be revised to clearly include this information.

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 and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the programme specific documentation submitted prior to the visit there was no mention of the arrangements for the post of external examiner for the programme. The education provider did submit documentation which related to the internal validation of all of the programmes being validated at the event. This documentation stated that for each profession there would be profession specific external examiners. The visitors were satisfied with this blanket statement but for clarity require the education provider to revise the programme specific documentation to include clear reference to this standard of education and training.

Commendations

The visitors wish to commend the following aspects of the programme:

Commendation: The visitors wish to commend the education provider's innovative design and implementation of the diverse profession programme portfolio of which this programme is part of.

Reason: The education provider has designed this programme to be a part of a major combined portfolio of programmes which share common inter-professional modules alongside the profession specific modules. The visitors considered the design of the three year programme to raise the recognition of the professional profile of operating department practitioners amongst all health practitioners and were impressed by the faculty and programme teams' dedication and enthusiasm to this inter-professional learning approach.

Nick Clark
Andrew Steel

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University College London
Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsych)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Clinical psychologist
Date of visit	18 -19 March 2010

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 14 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 24 May 2010 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 8 June 2010. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 13 May 2010. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 7 July 2010.

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Harry Brick (Practitioner Psychologist) Sabiha Azmi (Practitioner Psychologist) Margaret Curr (Physiotherapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	42 per year
Initial approval	July 2009
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Dr Hilary Richards (University College London)
Members of the joint panel	Dr Chris McCusker (British Psychological Society) Dr Elizabeth Anderson (British Psychological Society) Lindsay McNair (British Psychological Society) Sally Anne Clarke (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

Recommendations are observations on the programme which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval.

Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: The documentation received by the visitors prior to the visit stated that the education provider was working to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed, by the end of April 2010. During the tour of facilities the visitors were shown the database where all information regarding practice placement educators was retained. This was a detailed system but as yet it did not contain information regarding the registration status of the practice placement educators. At the meeting with the programme team the visitors were informed that all practice placement educators were to be written to and asked for the information regarding their registration status. Also the programme team confirmed that only appropriately registered practice placement educators would be used. The visitors considered that this information was required to ensure that the education provider could be assured that they were using appropriately registered staff to supervise the trainees. Therefore the visitors would like to receive documentation that clearly sets out procedures as to how the education provider will ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

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

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress is clearly specified.

Reason: In the documentation provided to visitors before the event there was information regarding the failure of the first practice placement. The documentation suggested that any placement failure was made up at the end of the programme, thereby extending the programme from three years to three years and six months. However, it was not clear if it was the whole placement that had to be retrieved if failed or just certain areas had to be retrieved to ensure that the trainee met all the relevant standards of proficiency for the programme. In the practice placement educators meeting it was obvious that the situation regarding failure had not arisen as any possible issues regarding a failing student were normally dealt with at an early stage such as at the mid placement review meetings between the trainee, practice placement educator and the trainee's

tutor. This was confirmed at the meeting with the programme team where it was said that if a placement in the first year was failed it would be retrieved as a whole at the end of the programme.

The visitors considered that whilst a failure on placement had not occurred, the documentation needed to clearly articulate how incidence of failure on practice placements would be dealt with. Therefore the visitors would like to receive revised documentation that clearly specifies the action to be taken in the case of failure in a practice placement.

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 clearly articulate within the assessment regulations that external examiners appointed to the programme must be on the relevant part of HPC's Register, unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was detail regarding the appointment of external examiners, and that they would be HPC registered. However there was no evidence of this within the assessment regulations for the programme. The visitors were happy with the planned external examiner arrangements for the programme but would like to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiners on the programme have been included in the assessment regulations to demonstrate the recognition of this requirement.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider revising the programme documentation to make sure that the International Language Testing System (IELTS) is at a consistent level across the programme documentation.

Reason: The visitors were happy that the admissions documentation was clear in stating the evidence of a good command of written, spoken and reading of English and that IELTS 7 was the level expected. In addition to the admissions documentation that applicants receive, they can view all the programme documentation prior to applying. However in places in the programme documentation IELTS 6 and 7 appeared to be interchangeable. The visitors wanted the programme team to be aware that consistency in the IELTS score should be clear in all documentation.

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 programme team should review the availability of IT facilities on campus.

Reason: Whilst the visitors were happy with the IT facilities available to trainees when on campus the visitors felt the facilities could be enhanced in terms of the availability of printing and computer terminals. Currently when the trainees are on campus the IT facilities in cluster rooms could possibly be booked for other teaching and this might hinder the preparation time for the trainees. Given the programme's laudatory reliance on web pages and email communication with stakeholders, the potential lack of computer access for trainees is a concern. The visitors recognised that the building has wireless connectivity and that most of the trainees have computers who can access the internet through this. However, they felt that in light of the fact the building is wireless and the majority of trainees have computers, a review of IT facilities could lead to enhancements in availability for trainees on the programme.

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.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider including the learning outcomes alongside the aims and objectives in the unit descriptors.

Reason: The visitors were content that there was evidence within the programme documentation which showed that the learning outcomes ensured those who successfully completed the programme would meet the standards of proficiency. However, the visitors felt that the learning outcomes could be more easily identified within the unit descriptors. This was because in addition to the information included in the unit descriptors (identified as objectives) there was

information about learning outcomes within other programme documentation. For example, during the tour the visitors were shown a database that was accessible to all trainees and clearly defined the learning outcomes for the programme. The visitors considered that by including this information directly into the unit descriptors articulation between the unit learning outcomes, assessment strategies and learning processes would facilitate the trainees' ability to meet the standards of proficiency

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider adopting a responsive system to the data collected from the audits for the practice placements.

Reason: The visitors were happy with the auditing and monitoring system in place. However the visitors considered that the information collected and evaluated by the education provider could be more proactively used, and the relevant feedback to practice placement educators and managers reported via routine quality assurance channels. The visitors considered that by evaluating the audit information it would enhance and effective monitoring system already in place.

Harry Brick
Sabiha Azmi
Margaret Curr