

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Coventry University and University of Warwick
Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin.Psy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Clinical psychologist
Date of visit	29 – 30 March 2011

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 16 May 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 9 June 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 14 July 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2011.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	17
First approved intake	1 January 1998
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Ann Green (Coventry University)
Secretary	Maureen Hunter (Coventry University)
Members of the joint panel	Susan Llewelyn (British Psychological Society) Carol Martin (British Psychological Society) Rosemary Jenkins (British Psychological Society) Victoria Green (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 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 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 revisit the programme admissions documentation to include information regarding their accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanism policies.

Reason: The admissions documentation provided prior to the visit made no mention of the procedures for accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms. Upon further discussions at the visit it became clear that the education provider did not accredit (experiential) learning or use other inclusion mechanisms for potential applicants to the programme. This information should be clearly communicated to potential applicants. The visitors require the programme admissions documentation to be revised to clearly include this information, to ensure that potential applicants have all of the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must outline the mechanisms in place to ensure that specialist visiting lecturers have relevant specialist expertise and up to date knowledge and to guarantee the quality of their teaching.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that specialist visiting lecturers are integral to the delivery of the curriculum. The visitors noted in discussions with the programme team that the role of the module coordinator is a key safeguard in monitoring the quality of specialist visiting lecturers. The visitors also noted that evaluation forms were completed by students at the end of a visiting lecturer's teaching. The visitors however, could not clearly determine what formal mechanisms were in place to ensure that the specialist visiting lecturers have the specialist expertise and up to date knowledge to ensure that the students could meet the relevant learning outcomes. The visitors could also not determine how the programme team guaranteed the quality of the specialist visiting lecturers' teaching. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider guarantees and safeguards the quality of the teaching of the specialist visiting lecturers.

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

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

Reason: From the documents submitted and discussions with the programme team the visitors were not able to clearly define the formal policies and processes

that the education provider uses to approve new placements. The visitors noted that the education provider has a thorough and effective system in place for the monitoring of existing placements via the audit tool. The visitors also noted discussions with the programme team outlining how they would approve a new placement. However, the visitors require further information about the protocols in place to approve placements before they are used. This is to ensure that new placements are not approved retrospectively and that students will not go to a new placement setting before it has been audited.

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 review its collaborative role with practice placement providers to ensure that any gaps in students' clinical experience and professional conduct highlighted in a previous placement are taken forward when students transfer to a new practice placement setting.

Reason: The visitors noted discussions with the students, the programme team and the practice placement educators which outlined the process that a student goes through when drawing up a learning contract when they start a new placement. The visitors also noted in discussions with the programme team the role and importance of the mid-placement review in ensuring that any gaps in students' required practical experience from previous placement are addressed. However, the visitors articulated that if there were any gaps in students' clinical experience or professional conduct, from a previous placement, not addressed within the learning contract, the mid-placement review could happen too late in the placement to address these gaps. The visitors therefore noted the importance of the learning contract in ensuring that students meet all of the learning outcomes associated with practice placements and that students are currently responsible for transferring information from one placement to the next. The visitors therefore require the education provider to review the process by which learning contracts are drawn up and agreed. This should ensure that students, practice placement providers and the education provider work collaboratively and are aware of what a student needs to achieve while on practice placement. This will then ensure that any gaps in students' clinical experience and professional conduct will always be included when the learning contract is negotiated, before a placement begins. The visitors will then have sufficient evidence to be sure that all parties know what a student has to achieve prior to starting their placement.

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 reviewing the advertising material, including the Clearing House website, to ensure that applicants to the programme are aware of the reasonable adjustments that can be made to aid students with specific health requirements.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors are satisfied that this standard has been met. However, the visitors noted in discussion with the programme team a number of examples were given where reasonable adjustments had been made to support students on the programme. The visitors also noted on page 23 of the programme handbook a clear statement that reasonable adjustments can be made to the teaching, learning, assessment and support of the programme. The visitors felt however, that information about the reasonable adjustments and the support mechanisms that the programme team were operating could be made more explicit in the advertising materials, including the Clearing House website. This would then ensure that the options and services available to individuals with specific health requirements are clearly and consistently highlighted to potential applicants and students.

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 taking a more proactive and strategic approach in the implementation of its equality and diversity policies.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors are satisfied that this standard has been met. The visitors noted that the programme team monitors and analyses the admissions data that it receives from the Clearing House as well as data from its own admissions processes. The visitors also noted that the education provider gave an example of some engagement work with undergraduate psychologists in an attempt to raise the profile of clinical psychology to currently under-represented groups. The visitors would like the programme team to consider taking a more strategic approach to the way it implements its equality and diversity policies. The visitors would like the education provider to consider formulating an equality and diversity strategy at a programme level to ensure that the work that is currently being undertaken around equality and diversity is conducted in a consistent, transparent and measured way.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider developing a more explicit strategy that outlines how the programme develops consultancy and leadership skills throughout the course of the programme and prepares students for working within the context of the modern NHS.

Reason: The visitors noted discussions with the students, the programme team and the practice placement educators that outlined the importance of students developing consultancy and leadership skills throughout the course of the programme. The visitors noted a number of examples given by the students that demonstrated that they were able to gain good experiences of consultancy and leadership development within a placement setting. The visitors were satisfied that students were able to develop consultancy and leadership skills whilst on placements. However, from the discussions the visitors were unable to see a clear strategy outlining how the programme team were developing consultancy and leadership skills throughout the duration of the programme. The visitors would like the education provider to consider developing a holistic strategy that would enhance the current arrangement by which students develop consultancy and leadership skills on placements. The visitors recommend that the programme team develops strategies that allow students to develop consultancy and leadership skills throughout the duration of the programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider taking a more strategic and proactive approach when encouraging experienced supervisors to take up practice placement educator refresher training.

Reason: The visitors noted discussions with the programme team which outlined the difficulties the programme team have in ensuring that some more experienced practice placement educators undertake practice placement educator refresher training. The visitors noted that the education provider does offer practice placement educator refresher training to practice placement educators and are satisfied that this standard is met. The visitors would however, encourage the programme team to continue to offer regular practice placement educator refresher training to all practice placement educators. The visitors would like the education provider to consider taking a more strategic and proactive approach when encouraging experienced supervisors to take up practice placement educator refresher training.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to ensure that the minimum length of weekly formal supervision expected between a practice placement educator and a student is consistently stated.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted inconsistencies concerning the minimum length of weekly formal supervision

expected between a practice placement educator and a student. The visitors recommend the education provider amends the programme documentation to mitigate against any confusion between practice placement educators and students.

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 education provider should consider including a clear statement outlining that the exit award of MSc in Therapeutic Psychology does not confer eligibility to apply to the HPC Register as a Clinical psychologist.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors are satisfied that this standard has been met. The visitors recognise that the programme title is clear and does not contain any reference to a HPC protected title however they would like the education provider to consider including a clear statement outlining that the exit award of MSc in Therapeutic Psychology does not confer eligibility to apply to the HPC Register as a Clinical psychologist.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions at the visit the visitors were happy that the requirements of the HPC relating to this standard are being met. The visitors did however feel that the aegrotat policy could be more clearly communicated within the documentation.

Sabiha Azmi
Robert Stratford

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Keele University & Staffordshire University
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	8 – 9 March 2011

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 3 May 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 9 June 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 30 June 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2011.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event as the professional body 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) Annie Mitchell (Clinical psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
Proposed student numbers	15
Initial approval	1 January 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Steve Wyn Williams (Staffordshire University)
Secretary	Jackie Campbell (Staffordshire University)
Members of the joint panel	Elena Alexandrou (British Psychological Society) Myra Cooper (British Psychological Society) Isabel Hargreaves (British Psychological Society) Robert Knight (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society) Stephen Morley (British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme.

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 in use is reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider prior to the visit did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. The visitors noted a number of instances where out-of-date terminology was evident or terminology was not consistently applied throughout the documentation and advertising materials. The documentation on occasion referenced the HPC as 'accrediting' the programme. The HPC does not 'accredit' education programmes instead we 'approve' education programmes. The visitors also noted that the documentation stated, on occasion, that completion of the programme will enable graduates to register with the HPC. All students need to apply to Register after they have successfully completed the programme and as such the language the education provider uses needs to reflect this. The education provider needs to make it clear to applicants and students that completion of the programme means they are eligible to apply for registration with the HPC. The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation; including advertising materials to ensure that it fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC and are consistent throughout.

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 amend the programme documentation to ensure that any applicant is able to clearly access information about the protocols, resources and support in place to make reasonable adjustments for students who may require it.

Reason: Through the review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider has protocols in place to make reasonable adjustments for applicants and students with certain health requirements. However, the visitors also noted that the programme documentation did not clearly highlight information about the education providers' reasonable adjustment protocols. The documentation also lacked information about the potential resources and support available to support the welfare and wellbeing of these students. The visitors require the programme documentation to be amended to ensure that any applicant or student with specific health requirements would be able to clearly access information about the education provider's reasonable adjustment protocols and information about the potential resources and support available. This is to ensure that applicants have the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to

take up a place on the programme and that the programme continues to meet this standard.

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 implement formal written protocols to obtain consent when students participate as service users.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team that consent was obtained verbally from students when they participated as service users in clinical and practical teaching. As a consequence the visitors noted that there was no formal mechanism in place to gain students consent. It is also the case that as no formal mechanism was in place to gain students' consent there was no evidence of how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained or how situations where students declined from participation were managed. In light of this, the visitors were not satisfied the programme has appropriate protocols in place to gain informed consent from students. This could lead to academic appeals and students successfully completing the programme despite the programme team having concerns about their fitness to practice. The visitors therefore require the education provider to implement formal protocols for obtaining consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching (such as alternative learning arrangements).

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

Condition: The education provider must review the assessment regulations and pastoral support offered to ensure that flexibility is given to individual students who are required to take a leave of absence and that they are dealt with on a case by case basis.

Reason: From a review of the assessment regulations and from discussions with the students the visitors noted that if any student was required to take more than four weeks leave of absence due to extenuating circumstances they would be expected to intermit for twelve months without salary. The visitors noted the anxiety that this assessment regulation was causing a number of students and require the education provider to review this policy to ensure a more flexible approach is adopted, students are reviewed on a case by case basis and pastoral support is offered to students if they have to take an extended period of leave.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider taking a more strategic approach in the monitoring and implementation of its equality and diversity policies.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors are satisfied that this standard has been met. The visitors did however feel that that the programme team should consider taking a more strategic approach to the way it monitors and implements its equality and diversity policies. The visitors would like the education provider to consider formulating an equality and diversity strategy at a programme level to ensure that the work that is currently being undertaken around equality and diversity is conducted in a consistent, transparent and measured way.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider maintains effective dialogue and communication with the employing trusts and strategic health authority to ensure that the programme continues to have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: The visitors noted in discussions with the senior management team, representatives from local employing trusts and strategic health authority that the programme is secure for the near future. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the discussions identified certain funding pressures within the programme. The visitors recommend that the education provider maintains effective dialogue and communication with the employing trusts and strategic health authority to ensure that the programme continues to have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing and enhancing the monitoring mechanisms in place to ensure that the views of key stakeholders influence the strategic direction and development of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from dialogue with the programme team the visitors are satisfied that this standard has been met. From discussions with the placement providers the visitors noted that the programme team are responsive to the views of stakeholders. However, the visitors feel that the programme team could develop this work and should consider reviewing and enhancing the monitoring mechanisms in place to ensure

that the views of key stakeholders influence the strategic direction and development of the programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to monitor the number of staff in place to ensure an effective programme is delivered.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors are satisfied that this standard has been met. However, the visitors did note in discussions with students that during periods of staff annual leave it can be difficult for the students to get to speak with a member of the programme team. The visitors also noted in discussions with the programme team that it was acknowledged that the programme team had previously been stretched in terms of staffing, however they were now in a more sustainable position. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider should continue to monitor the number of staff in place to ensure that the problems identified can be dealt with and that an effective programme continues to be delivered.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the student experience of pastoral support.

Reason: In discussion with the students the visitors noted that some students raised concerns around the perceived variance in terms of the quality of pastoral support offered by different members of the programme team. The visitors were satisfied that this standard is met. However, they recommend that the programme team consider reviewing the systems of pastoral support in place to ensure that students are assured that a consistent provision is offered throughout.

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider continues to review the teaching and learning approaches utilised within the programme to ensure students are sufficiently prepared in terms of theory and specialist client group knowledge when integrating into the full range of practice placement settings.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors are satisfied that this standard has been met. However the visitors noted comments from students and practice placement educators that sometimes students did not have the theory and specialist client group knowledge required for each practice placement setting. The visitors would like the programme team to consider reflecting on this feedback and continue to review the teaching and learning curriculum in order to improve the integration of theory and practice.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider amending module descriptors to clearly highlight HPC publications and standards.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met. Though this is the case the visitors articulated that that the module descriptors do not make clear reference to the available HPC publications and standards such as the Guidance on conduct and ethics for students. The visitors recommend that the education provider considers including HPC publications and standards in relevant reading lists to ensure that students are aware of the implications of the HPC standards of conduct performance and ethics.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the modular structure of the programme and the associated assessment processes.

Reason: The visitors were happy that sufficient evidence was provided in the documentation and at the visit to ensure that the programme continues to meet this standard. However, in discussions with the programme team and the students the visitors noted that the current modular structure and associated assessment processes can place a high level of burden on the programme team and students. The visitors recommend that the programme team consider simplifying the current modular structure and associated assessment processes. In this way the programme team may be able to reduce the burden on students and staff without impacting on the attainment level and quality of students.

Annie Mitchell
Sabiha Azmi

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust
Validating body / Awarding body	Oxford University
Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin Psych)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Clinical psychologist
Date of visit	10 – 11 May 2011

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 20 June 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 7 July 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 29 June 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 25 August 2011.

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 as 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 (Clinical psychologist) Robert Stratford (Educational psychologist)
HPC executive officers (in attendance)	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	15
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	1 September 2011
Chair	John Hall (Oxford Brookes University)
Members of the joint panel	Theresa Powell (British Psychological Society) Paul Camic (British Psychological Society) Simon Eltringham (British Psychological Society) Lauren Ison (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 have ongoing approval confirmed.

The visitors agreed that 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining one 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.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must provide a clear statement in the programme documentation to identify the level of English language proficiency required for successful application to the programme.

Reason: Having scrutinised the programme documentation the visitors were satisfied that the programme applied selection and entry criteria to ensure that successful applicants have a good command of reading, writing and spoken English. However, the visitors were unable to identify how the programme clearly articulated their English language proficiency requirement to potential applicants. As this requirement was not clearly articulated this could lead to an applicant successfully appealing a decision not to let them onto the programme. Therefore the visitors require the programme team to include a clear statement to articulate the proficiency of English an applicant would have to demonstrate in order to successfully apply to the programme. This will ensure that a potential applicant will have all of the information they require to make an informed choice about applying and taking up an offer of a place on a programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide a clear statement in the programme documentation to inform potential applicants that the programme does not accredit prior experiential learning.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors were satisfied that the programme does not accredit prior experiential learning (APEL). However, the visitors could only identify a clear statement regarding this in the standards of education and training mapping, not in the programme documentation or advertising materials. As this policy regarding APEL is not included in the programme documentation, this could potentially lead to an appeal and an unsuitable applicant gaining a place on the programme. Therefore the visitors require the programme team to include a clear statement that the programme does not accredit prior experiential learning. This will ensure that a potential applicant will have all of the information they require to make an informed choice about applying to the programme and that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how best to continue the work to address identified equality and diversity issues such as the disparity in the gender of students on the programme.

Reason: In discussion at the visit the visitors noted that equality and diversity information is collected and collated by the clearing house website which handles the initial applications to the programme. This information is fed back to the programme team and actions were being taken as a result of the data provided. Therefore the visitors were satisfied that the programme continues to meet this standard. However the programme team did identify that work was still continuing to address issues of equality and diversity in the student population of the programme, particularly to address the gender disparity of applicants. The visitors recommend that the programme team continue this work to ensure as great a diversity of student population on the programme as possible.

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 education provider should consider how best to support practice placement educators in ensuring that the trusts providing practice placements are providing sufficient resources to students while on practice placement.

Reason: The visitors noted in the information provided, and in discussions at the visit, that the programme has in place approval and monitoring mechanisms to ensure that there are sufficient resources on practice placements to support students' learning. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that the programme meets this standard. However, in discussion with the practice placement providers and educators, it was identified that NHS trust budget constraints were affecting the availability of resources for students on some placements. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team continue to work alongside practice placement educators to ensure that the trusts providing practice placements make sufficient resources available to support students. In this way any shortfall in a trust's provision of resources for students can be mitigated through joint support from practice placement educators and the programme team.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how to continue the work, currently being undertaken, to best utilise the feedback from students regarding their practice placements.

Reason: In discussion with the trainees and with the programme team, it was made clear to the visitors that there is a comprehensive student feedback system for practice placements. This feedback is utilised by the programme team as an integral part of the approval and monitoring of practice placements. The visitors are therefore happy that the programme continues to meet this standard. The practice placement educators did, however, state that further feedback from students regarding their placement experience would be useful for their own professional development. When this issue was raised with the programme team it was clear that work was being undertaken to better utilise student feedback. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team continue their work to develop the use of feedback and investigate how best to provide practice placement educators with more information regarding students' placement experience.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider ways to ensure that all clinical supervisors new to supervision are adequately trained and that all supervisors new to the programme are appropriately orientated.

Reason: From the discussions at the visit and in the programme information provided, the visitors noted that the programme has a comprehensive training offering available to practice placement educators. It was also made clear that any new educators would be expected to undertake the initial training provided in order to supervise a student. Therefore the visitors were satisfied that the programme continues to meet this standard. However, in discussion with the students it was made clear that some practice placement educators who did not undertake the initial training were less able to supervise students than those that had. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team consider ways to ensure that all practice placement educators new to supervision undertake appropriate supervisor training. They also suggest that the programme team consider ensuring that all practice placement educators new to the programme should be appropriately orientated to the requirements of this particular programme. In this way the programme team will be able to ensure an even greater equivalence of student experience across all of the various practice placements.

Robert Stratford
Harry Brick