

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Aston University
Programme name	Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Hearing aid dispensers
Date of visit	2 – 3 March 2011

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Hearing aid dispenser' 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 April 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 May 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 1 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 Hearing aid dispenser profession came onto the register in April 2010 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was an HPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional bodies did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered a different programme – BSc (Hons) Audiology. A separate report exists for this programme.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Tim Pringle (Hearing aid dispenser) Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
HPC observer	Osama Ammar
Proposed student numbers	25
Initial approval	28 September 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Ros Hill (Aston University)
Secretary	Gillian Cook (Aston University)

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider 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. The documentation referenced the HPC as 'accrediting' the programme. The HPC does not 'accredit' education programmes instead we 'approve' education programmes. The visitors considered the current terminology in place could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to be amended to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology to ensure consistency and to ensure this SET is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence outlining the approach used to effectively and thoroughly approve and monitor placements which are located outside of the local area.

Reason: The visitors noted the system in place for the approval and monitoring of placements within the local area of the programme and considered this to be thorough and effective. However, through discussions with the programme team and students, the visitors noted newly acquired placement settings were increasingly spread out further away in terms of their geographical position to the programme. The visitors also noted that the programme is planning to approve and monitor placements outside of the local area using technology such as Skype in an attempt to alleviate some of the human resource impact. The visitors require further evidence outlining the plans for the development of this approval and monitoring tool, evidence of protocols and details of projected timescales and action plans, to ensure the approaches used for placement settings outside the local area of the programme will be thorough and effective.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate the mechanisms in place that ensure practice placement educators have undertaken appropriate practice placement educator training and are given programme specific information. The education provider must also provide further evidence regarding the planned implementation of the e-learning training for practice placement educators.

Reason: Evidence provided prior to the visit indicated the education provider held training sessions for practice placement educators. From discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider approves practice placement educators who may have undertaken practice placement educator training from other education providers.

The visitors were concerned this could mean the practice placement educators, although trained to undertake work with students, would not be aware of the programme specific intricacies and may not fully be aware of the implications of working with students from this programme. Further discussion with the programme team indicated the education provider had planned for the implementation of e-learning training for practice placement educators.

In order to ensure the education provider is ensuring appropriately trained practice placement educators undertake work with students, the visitors require further evidence that outlines the mechanisms used to ensure practice placement educators have received appropriate training to work with students from their programme, how they ensure training from other education providers is consistent with their own training provision and how they ensure practice placement educators receive programme specific information. The visitors also require evidence outlining the planned implementation date for the e-learning resource and evidence of protocols outlining the scope of the project.

Tim Pringle
Hugh Crawford

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Aston University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Audiology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Hearing aid dispensers
Date of visit	2 – 3 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 'Hearing aid dispenser' 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 April 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 May 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 1 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 Hearing aid dispenser profession came onto the register in April 2010 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was an HPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional bodies did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered a different programme – Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology. A separate report exists for this programme.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Tim Pringle (Hearing aid dispenser) Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
HPC observer	Osama Ammar
Proposed student numbers	25
Initial approval	28 September 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Ros Hill (Aston University)
Secretary	Gillian Cook (Aston University)

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 recommendation for the programme.

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

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider prior to the visit did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. The visitors noted a number of instances where out-of-date terminology was evident. The documentation referenced the HPC as 'accrediting' the programme. The HPC does not 'accredit' education programmes instead we 'approve' education programmes. The visitors also noted inconsistencies throughout the documentation in the way the education provider referred to the programme award title. The current HPC approved programme title is BSc (Hons) Audiology, however the visitors' noted the education provider frequently referred to the programme as 'BSc Audiology' and in the programme specification referred to the programme as 'BSc (Hons) Audiology with Professional Training'. The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the award title is consistently referred to throughout the documentation. The visitors considered the current terminology in place could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to be amended to remove any instance of incorrect or out-of-date terminology to ensure consistency and to ensure this SET is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence outlining the approach used to effectively and thoroughly approve and monitor placements which are located outside of the local area.

Reason: The visitors noted the system in place for the approval and monitoring of placements within the local area of the programme and considered this to be thorough and effective. However, through discussions with the programme team and students, the visitors noted newly acquired placement settings were increasingly spread out further away in terms of their geographical position to the programme. The visitors also noted that the programme is planning to approve and monitor placements outside of the local area using technology such as Skype in an attempt to alleviate some of the human resource impact. The visitors require further evidence outlining the plans for the development of this approval and monitoring tool, evidence of protocols and details of projected timescales and action plans, to ensure the approaches used for placement settings outside the local area of the programme will be thorough and effective.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate the mechanisms in place that ensure practice placement educators have undertaken appropriate practice placement educator training and are given programme specific information. The education provider must also provide further evidence regarding the planned implementation of the e-learning training for practice placement educators.

Reason: Evidence provided prior to the visit indicated the education provider held training sessions for practice placement educators. From discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider approves practice placement educators who may have undertaken practice placement educator training from other education providers.

The visitors were concerned this could mean the practice placement educators, although trained to undertake work with students, would not be aware of the programme specific intricacies and may not fully be aware of the implications of working with students from this programme. Further discussion with the programme team indicated the education provider had planned for the implementation of e-learning training for practice placement educators.

In order to ensure the education provider is ensuring appropriately trained practice placement educators undertake work with students, the visitors require further evidence that outlines the mechanisms used to ensure practice placement educators have received appropriate training to work with students from their programme, how they ensure training from other education providers is consistent with their own training provision and how they ensure practice placement educators receive programme specific information. The visitors also require evidence outlining the planned implementation date for the e-learning resource and evidence of protocols outlining the scope of the project.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider may wish to consider introducing an independent sector placement setting to help ensure students gain access to a wider range of learning experiences.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team, the visitors are satisfied that the number, duration and range of practice placements are appropriate and support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. The visitors noted in the discussions with the programme team and students' examples were given of students gaining experience in the independent sector. The visitors wish to support and encourage the programme team to continue facilitating independent sector placements for students and consider enhancing this practise so all students can gain access to a wider range of learning experiences.

Tim Pringle
Hugh Crawford

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Clinical psychologist
Date of visit	18 - 19 March 2011

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Condition	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 21 April 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 May 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 21 April 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 May 2011.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner 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. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. 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 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 education provider and the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Laura Golding (Clinical psychologist)
HPC executive officer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	33
Initial approval	January 2008
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Keith Gwilym (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Secretary	Samantha Ray (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Members of the joint panel	Richard Brown (Internal Panel Member) Dan Donoghue (Internal Panel Member) Steven Davies (British Psychological Society) Helen Beinart (British Psychological Society) Nick McGuire (British Psychological Society) Robert Knight (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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

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

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

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

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

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

Condition

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation provided to clearly state that the requirement for trainees to progress through the programme by meeting relevant professional competencies takes precedent over time spent on practice placement.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation that trainees were expected to meet relevant professional competencies while on practice placement in order for them to progress through the programme. They also noted that there was a requirement for trainees to complete 333 days in a practice placement setting in order to successfully progress through and complete the programme. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that trainees would progress and successfully complete the programme if they met the relevant competencies and that it was only an expectation that this would normally be completed in 333 days. However, the visitors articulated that the programme documentation did not make the distinction clear between the requirement to meet the competencies and the normally expected time period when this would be undertaken. This lack of clarity may lead to trainees being successful with academic appeals and completing the programme, becoming eligible to apply for registration with the HPC, despite possible concerns of the programme team. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be revised to ensure that trainees are clear that meeting the competencies takes precedent over and above the amount of time spent on placement.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform the HPC if any changes are made to the way in which Trust Training Coordinators interact with the programme

Reason: In the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted the key role that the Trust Training Coordinators play in organising, approving, monitoring and coordinating practice placements for trainees. The visitors are therefore happy that this standard is met. However, in discussion with the senior team, the practice placement providers and the programme team the visitors noted the potential changes to the way those employed in these roles may interact with the programme in the future. The visitors recommend that the programme team and the practice placement providers do all they can to retain the knowledge and skill of those employed as Trust Training Coordinators despite the possible changes. The visitors also recommend that the programme team inform the HPC if any changes occur to the way the Trust Training Coordinators interact with the programme. This should be done through the major change process as any changes may affect how the programme continues to meet several SETs.

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

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how to continue to support practice placement supervisors in fulfilling their role assessing a trainee while they are undertaking a practice placement.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the practice placement educators that practice placement supervisors are fully prepared to supervise trainees undertaking practice placement. Therefore the visitors are happy that this standard is met. However the visitors recommend that the programme team continue their work to support practice placement supervisors. This is to ensure that supervisors are aware of the learning outcomes trainees are required to meet while on practice placement and also that they are sufficiently equipped to adequately assess trainees against these learning outcomes.

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 inform the HPC about any exit awards which may be instituted as a result of the recommendations of the internal panel.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided prior to the visit that there are no exit awards from the programme due to its integrative nature and lack of modularisation. This is clearly stated in the documentation and as such the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, in discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the internal panel were recommending that an exit award be introduced. The visitors therefore recommend that if an exit award from the programme was instituted, the education provider should notify the HPC through the major change process. This is due to the fact that the introduction of an exit award, which would not confer eligibility to apply to the HPC Register, may change how the programme continues to meet this standard.

Laura Golding
Ruth Baker

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Regent's College
Validating body / Awarding body	The Open University
Programme name	Practitioner Doctorate in Existential Phenomenological Counselling Psychology (DPsych)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Counselling psychologist
Date of visit	27 – 28 January 2011

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	17

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 April 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 May 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

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

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The 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	Ewan Gillon (Counselling Psychologist) David Packwood (Counselling Psychologist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
HPC observer	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Proposed student numbers	16-20
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2011
Chair	Alan Jones (Regent's College)
Secretary	Katy Bangs (Regent's College)
Members of the joint panel	Molly Ross (British Psychological Society) Nichola Hart (British Psychological Society) John Waite (British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HPC did not review external examiners reports for 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HPC met with students from the Doctorate in Counselling Psychology (DCounsPsy), as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 39 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 18 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

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 revise the admissions documentation to remove any erroneous references to the HPC and to ensure that all costs that are known are available so as to enable applicants to make an informed choice to take up a place on the programme.

Reason: During their reading prior to the visit the visitors noted that there were erroneous references regarding the HPC, made in the admissions documentation that an applicant would receive when making an application to the programme. For example, attributing HPC's entry requirements to the Register to the standards of education and training (SETs). The SETs do not require an education provider to undertake a health and character reference as part of a programme's admissions procedure. In addition, HPC has removed the requirement for a health reference upon application to the Register. In terms of fees, it was not clear in the application information what the known total costs would be for the programme. For example there was no reference made that an applicant might need to pay for an updated criminal record bureau check before going on placement.

During the meeting with the programme team the visitors discussed the erroneous references to the HPC and the costs for the programme. The team said that the application documentation had been written to reflect the HPC website. The team had not realised that for example the health reference was no longer a requirement for applying to the Register with the HPC. The team were happy to correct the erroneous references made to the HPC within the admissions documentation.

With regards to the full costs for the programme, the fees had yet to be set for the programme and therefore the total costs were not available. However the team said that once the fees and the add-on costs were available they would be published accordingly.

In order for the visitors to be satisfied that applicants receive the required information to make an informed choice to take up a place on the programme they would like to receive revised admissions documentation that removes erroneous references to the HPC and an indication of the proposed costs of the programme.

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.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to show how the equality and diversity policy is monitored in relation to admissions to the programme.

Reason: During their reading of the documentation prior to the visit the visitors could not see evidence of how the education provider's equality and diversity policy was monitored in relation to applicants to the programme.

During the meeting with the programme team the visitors discussed the education provider's equality and diversity policy and received from the team verbal confirmation that the policy was monitored to ensure that all applications are treated equitably. Staff are trained in current trends in equality and diversity and whilst the majority of the work remains with the Registry, so that statistics can be produced, the final check to ensure the policy is applied and monitored remains with the department.

The visitors would therefore like to receive revised documentation that articulates how the education provider monitors the equality and diversity policy in relation to admissions for the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From the discussions with the senior and programme teams, it was clear that there was a core programme team. Added to this, the education provider uses visiting lecturers to deliver salient parts of the programme. However it was not clear as to how many counselling psychologists and visiting lecturers taught on the programme or their commitment to this and other programmes within the education provider's portfolio of psychology programmes. It was also unclear as to the amount of academic and pastoral support undertaken by the Programme Director, and the nature of any succession planning processes linked to these.

The senior team and the programme team informed the visitors that they were confident that the proposed levels of staffing along with the visiting lecturer complement would be sufficient to deliver an effective programme.

For the visitors to be assured that this SET is met, they would like to receive clearly articulated documentation that indicates the core staff and visiting lecturers and their commitment to this and other programmes within the education provider's portfolio of psychology programmes. This documentation should also make reference to succession planning processes linked to all core roles on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: From the discussions with the senior and programme teams, it was clear that there was a core programme team. Added to this, the education provider uses visiting lecturers to deliver salient parts of the programme. However it was not clear as to which areas of the programme were taught by the counselling psychologists and visiting lecturers or their commitment to this and other programmes within the education provider's portfolio of psychology programmes. The senior and programme teams informed the visitors that they were confident that the proposed staffing complement would have the specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver the programme.

For the visitors to be assured that the subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge they would like to receive clearly articulated documentation which indicates which areas of the programme are taught by the core staff and which by the visiting lecturers, and their commitment to this and other programmes within the education provider's portfolio of psychology programmes.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the complaints process is clearly articulated to trainees.

Reason: The visitors received the complaints procedure in the documentation prior to the visit. However in the meeting with the trainees it became clear that, whilst they had not had to use such a policy, the trainees were not aware a written policy existed. The trainees did say that if they had any issues they would immediately go to the programme team and usually matters were dealt with quickly. In the meeting with the programme team the visitors were informed that there was a formal procedure which was managed through the School of Psychotherapy and Counselling Psychology.

The visitors would therefore like to receive clarification of how the education provider will ensure that the complaints process is clearly articulated to trainees.

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

Condition: The education provider must implement a formal fitness to practice process to deal with concerns regarding trainees profession-related conduct.

Reason: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team, the visitors identified that there was no formal process in place for dealing with concerns about trainees profession-related conduct. They did note that concerns could be raised about a trainees conduct and that those concerns would be dealt with via various meetings to include the trainee, the clinical supervisor and the practice placement educator if required. Measures were then put in place to deal with the conduct of the trainee and these measures would be reviewed at the regular meetings, which the trainee would attend to allow them to reflect on the issues. If a trainee was deemed as not fit to practice they would be asked to leave the programme.

The visitors therefore require evidence of a formal process to objectively and consistently deal with concerns regarding trainees profession-related conduct to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate how the standards of proficiency (SOPs) are ensured through the practice placement.

Reason: Through their reading of the documentation the visitors were unable to determine how the SOPs were to be delivered and met on placement. For example, the Trainee evaluation report required practice placement educators to grade trainees on a scale of 1 – 5, with level 3 being ‘at the level expected’ and overall as ‘satisfactory’ or ‘unsatisfactory’. There was no direct training or guidance which provided the practice placement educators with information about the learning outcomes, marking the trainees objectively or criteria against what a trainee should be marked and assessed on. It was therefore unclear to the visitors if the practice placement educators would interpret the learning outcomes equally and consistently across all trainees and they were concerned that this could lead to the inability of some trainees to meet the SOPs.

In the meeting with the programme team a discussion took place around placement learning outcomes and assessment and the training of practice placement educators in marking trainees to ensure they are able to practice. The programme team reported that there will be a clearer system of marking for practice placement educators that will allow a qualitative marking system to be used. Practice placement educators will be able to use a full range of marks to record a trainee’s performance on placement.

To ensure that this standard is met the visitors would like to receive revised documentation that clearly shows how practice placement educators are informed about how to interpret and mark the learning outcomes to ensure that the SOPs are met.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that there is a mechanism in place so that if a student is unable to secure an NHS placement, they can undertake an equivalent practice placement experience.

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team the visitors discussed with them the practice placements that could be undertaken by trainees. The team were asked if it was possible for a trainee to miss the third year placement within the NHS. The team said that this was possible especially in the light of current economic conditions where cuts on placements could be made.

The Practice placement handbook clearly states that the NHS placement must be undertaken in year three. However the trainee would have the responsibility of obtaining their own placement via the list of placements that is held by the practice placement co-ordinator. The visitors explored with the programme team the possible issues that could arise if a trainee could not obtain the requisite NHS placement in year three. The programme team said that there would be support for trainees to ensure that the requisite placements could be obtained.

In order to be assured that a trainee will receive the number, duration and range of practice placements appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes, the visitors would like to be assured of the mechanism which ensures an equivalent placement experience if a trainee is unable to secure a suitable NHS placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that there is a thorough and effective system of monitoring placements.

Reason: The visitors received as part of the visit documentation an Application and agreement form used to audit practice placements. However there was no indication as how the placements would be monitored once they had been approved.

In the meeting with the programme team the visitors were informed that a placement co-ordinator would be appointed to the programme and the role would include the monitoring of approved placements. This would include visiting the placements and trainees and collating the feedback received to ensure that the placement continues to meet the needs of trainees.

In order to be assured that this standard is met the visitors would like to receive documentation that specifies how the monitoring of approved placements will

continue after the placement has been approved along with any associated forms for completion.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that equality and diversity policies in relation to trainees on placement will be put in place, implemented and monitored.

Reason: Although the visitors received an Application and agreement form and Health and safety checklist used to audit practice placements in the documentation prior to the visit, there was no reference in these documents to the equality and diversity policies of practice placement providers. In the meeting with the programme team the visitors were informed that a placement co-ordinator would be appointed to the programme and the role would include the monitoring of approved placements. This would include the monitoring of all policies in relation to trainees at the placement areas.

The visitors would like to receive revised documentation that shows how the education provider ensures that equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and monitored at practice placement providers.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that practice placement educators must have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to offer supervision around programme learning outcomes.

Reason: During their meeting with the programme team the visitors discussed the way in which practice placement educators supervised and assessed the trainees whilst on placement. It was discussed that practice placement educators appointed to undertake trainees for placement must be accredited with the British Psychological Society and have at least three years' experience. However, there was no guidance for ensuring that a practice placement educator had the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to be able to supervise a trainee around the programme specific learning outcomes. For example the Trainee evaluation report required practice placement educators to grade trainees on a scale of 1 – 5, with level 3 being 'at the level expected'. The visitors were unsure where practice placement educators learnt about the level expected.

The visitors would like to receive documentation that clearly identifies how the education provider will ensure that practice placement educators will have the relevant knowledge and experience to offer supervision around programme specific learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to show how they ensure practice placement educators have undertaken appropriate initial and refresher training to ensure that they are clear about the education providers learning outcomes and assessment procedures.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors judged that it was not clear how the education provider ensured that practice placement educators would undertake appropriate training prior to working with trainees or continued to undertake any secondary training once working with trainees. In discussions with the programme team, it became evident that the programme team would offer initial and refresher training by holding open days, but it would not be mandatory and they would not monitor training attendance.

The visitors were aware there are difficulties in ensuring all practice placement educators are initially trained and then have undertaken follow up training. However the visitors considered that there were ways of ensuring that practice placement educators were trained to ensure that they could be clear on learning outcomes and assessment procedures. The visitors considered that training was an important role for the education provider and therefore the education provider should consider ways in which practice placement educators could receive training to ensure that they are able to understand the learning outcomes and assessment procedures of the education provider.

Therefore the visitors would like to receive further documentation to indicate how the education provider will train practice placement educators to ensure that they understand the learning outcomes and assessment procedures for the programme.

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

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

Condition: The education provider must articulate how all practice placement educators understand the assessment procedures for the programme and their relation to the learning outcomes relevant to the placement.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors judged that it was not clear how the education provider ensured that practice placement educators understand the assessment procedures for the programme and how these related to the learning outcomes for the programme. For example the Trainee Evaluation Report required practice placement educators to grade trainees on a scale of 1 – 5, with level 3 being ‘at the level expected’. The visitors were unsure where practice placement educators learnt about the level expected. In discussions with the programme team, it became evident that the programme team would offer initial and refresher training by holding open days, but it would not be mandatory and they would not monitor training attendance.

Therefore the visitors would like to receive further documentation to indicate how the education provider will ensure that practice placement educators understand the learning outcomes and assessment procedures for the programme.

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 ensure that the assessment for practice placements ensures that trainees who successfully complete the programme have met the SOPs for their part of the register.

Reason: Through their reading of the documentation the visitors were unable to determine how the SOPs were to be met on placement. For example, the Trainee evaluation report required practice placement educators to grade trainees on a scale of 1 – 5, with level 3 being ‘at the level expected’ and overall as ‘satisfactory’ or ‘unsatisfactory’. There was no direct training or guidance which provided the practice placement educators with information on marking the trainees objectively or criteria against what a trainee should be marked and assessed on. It was therefore unclear to the visitors if the practice placement educators would be marking equally and consistently across all trainees.

In the meeting with the programme team a discussion took place around placement assessment and the training of practice placement educators in marking trainees to ensure they are able to practice. The programme team reported that there will be a clearer system of marking for practice placement educators that will allow a qualitative marking system to be used. Practice placement educators will be able to use a full range of marks to record a trainee’s performance on placement.

To ensure that this standard is met the visitors would like to receive revised documentation that clearly shows how practice placement educators will assess trainees on placement to ensure that the SOPs are met.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the assessment methods employed articulate the levels of the learning outcomes for the programme.

Reason: From the visitors reading of the assessment documentation prior to the visit, they found it difficult to understand the reasoning for the different level of assessments at Masters and Doctoral level.

During the meeting with the programme team the visitors discussed the different assessment levels and the fact that aspects at each level could be open to interpretation. The visitors considered that the differentiation between the Masters and the Doctoral level in terms of assessment was not clear and therefore it was difficult to determine how the learning at each level is assessed. This could result in both assessors and students being unclear as to level of competence that is required to meet any specific learning outcome, leading to inconsistent assessment processes.

In order for the visitors to be assured that the assessment methods employed do successfully measure the learning outcomes for the programme they would like to receive revised documentation to illustrate that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that student performance is objective for the assessment of the practice placement to ensure that the trainee is fit to practice.

Reason: Through their reading of the documentation the visitors were unable to determine how the SOPs were to be met on placement. For example, the Trainee evaluation report required practice placement educators to grade trainees on a scale of 1 – 5, with level 3 being 'at the level expected' and overall as 'satisfactory' or 'unsatisfactory'. There was no direct training or guidance which provided the practice placement educators with information on marking the trainees objectively or criteria against what a trainee should be marked and assessed on. It was therefore unclear to the visitors if the practice placement educators would be marking equally and consistently across all trainees.

In the meeting with the programme team a discussion took place around placement assessment and the training of practice placement educators in marking trainees to ensure they are able to practice. The programme team reported that there will be a clearer system of marking for practice placement educators that will allow a qualitative marking system to be used. Practice placement educators will be able to use a full range of marks to record a trainee's performance on placement.

To ensure that this standard is met the visitors would like to receive revised documentation that clearly shows how practice placement educators will mark trainees on placement to ensure that the trainee is fit to practice.

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

Condition: The education provider must articulate how practice placement assessments are monitored and evaluated with regard to appropriate standards to assure the trainee's progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: Through their reading of the documentation the visitors were unable to determine how the SOPs were to be met on placement. For example, the Trainee evaluation report required practice placement educators to grade trainees on a scale of 1 – 5, with level 3 being 'at the level expected' and overall as 'satisfactory' or 'unsatisfactory'. There was no direct training or guidance which provided the practice placement educators with information on marking the trainees objectively or criteria against what a trainee should be marked and assessed on. It was therefore unclear to the visitors if the practice placement educators would be marking equally and consistently across all trainees.

In the meeting with the programme team a discussion took place around placement assessment and the training of practice placement educators in marking trainees to ensure they are able to practice. The programme team reported that there will be a clearer system of marking for practice placement educators that will allow a qualitative marking system to be used. Practice placement educators will be able to use a full range of marks to record a trainee's performance on placement.

To ensure that this standard is met the visitors would like to receive revised documentation that clearly shows how practice placement educators will mark trainees on placement that the trainee progresses appropriately within the programme.

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 revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the policy on aegrotat awards to state that they do not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register, and demonstrate how this information is clearly communicated to the trainees.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors found it difficult to determine the assessment regulations for the programme and how these are conveyed to trainees so that it is clear that aegrotat awards would not enable students to be eligible to apply to the Register.

In the meeting with the programme team they stated that they did not have an aegrotat award. However the regulations for the validating body do allow for an award. If the validating body regulations are implemented and apply to this programme, then a clear assessment regulation needs to be in place to ensure that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to the register.

In order for the visitors to be assured that any aegrotat award offered does not provide eligibility for admissions to the Register they would like to receive clear documentation to indicate the assessment regulation relating to aegrotat awards.

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 standardise, for transparency reasons, the application of its entry and selection procedures to the programme.

Reason: The visitors were content that this standard was met in terms of how the education provider invokes its entry and selection process for the programme. However they considered that to make it transparent and open to all those who apply to the programme the education provider should make it clear in all documentation and the website how this process occurs.

In the meeting with the programme team, the programme team clearly described the way the system for entry and selection occurs and the feedback given to applicants as part of this process.

The visitors considered that the education provider could enhance the selection and entry criteria by clearly setting out the feedback given to applicants in terms of enhancing the transparency of the procedure and allowing applicants to make an informed choice to take up a place on the programme.

Ewan Gillon
David Packwood

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Scottish Ambulance Academy and Glasgow Caledonian University
Validating body / Awarding body	Glasgow Caledonian University
Programme name	DipHE Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	5 – 6 April 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 'Paramedic' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 13 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 12 May 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 25 April 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 May 2011.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and validating body validated the programme. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of 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 education provider outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Susan Boardman (Paramedic)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ben Potter
HPC observer	Victoria Adenugba
Proposed student numbers	50 (2 cohorts per year of 25)
Proposed start date of programme	5 June 2011
Chair	Les Wood (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Secretary	Alen MacKinlay (Glasgow Caledonian University)
Members of the joint panel	Elizabeth Mooney (Internal panel member) Gerry Egan (External panel member) David Fitzpatrick (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 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"/>

The HPC met with students from the Scottish Ambulance College's IHCD Paramedic Award as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 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 approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clarify issues around the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) requirement for admission to the programme and to clarify how many students will be undertaking the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in discussion with the programme team and the senior team that the programme will have two intake points per year with 25 students per cohort. However, in the documentation provided prior to the approval visit that there were some inconsistencies in describing the number of students who would be completing the programme each year (p17 of the programme approval document.) They also noted that the documentation stated that the HPC required the applicants to the programme to achieve IELTS 7 or above. HPC does not set any English requirement for applicants to an education or training programme but does require applicants to the Register to be at IELTS 7 or above. The visitors therefore require these issues to be clarified in the documentation. This is to ensure that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require to make an informed choice as to whether to take up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide examples of the module evaluation forms which the programme modules will be subject to.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that the programme's modules will be subject to the established Glasgow Caledonian University student evaluation system. However, as the modules had not been fully integrated into the appropriate software at the time of the visit, there were no examples of this student evaluation for the visitors to view. As this was the case the visitors require an example of the evaluation a student would be likely to complete for the modules on this programme. This is to ensure that there are regular evaluation systems in place and that the programme can meet this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide examples of the audits which have been undertaken for placements in the wider healthcare setting.

Reason: From the documentation provided and from discussions at the visit the visitors were satisfied that the practice placements within the ambulance service were subject to a thorough and effective approval and monitoring system. However, the visitors were not clear as to how the programme team were

extending this system to those placements students were expected to complete in a 'wider healthcare setting'. The programme team identified that the same process was used to approve and monitor these placements but no examples of the completed forms were available at the visit. The visitors therefore require evidence as to how the programme team ensures that the placements outside of the ambulance service meet the standards expected of the placements completed within the ambulance service. This is to ensure that all of the placements undertaken by students are subject to the same effective approval and monitoring system and that the programme can meet this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of the Medical Director's agreement to ensure that the key skills students have to evidence in the practice portfolio can be met by practicing under supervision on placement.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that the practice placement portfolio required students to meet a number of learning outcomes by evidencing a wide range of skills. This included specific skills such as needle thorococentesis and needle cricothyroidotomy. In discussion with the programme team the visitors established that students could demonstrate some of these skills through simulation and be assessed through objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs). However, the visitors also noted that students could demonstrate these skills, under supervision, while on placement and be assessed through the practice placement portfolio. The visitors also noted that an agreement was in place, between the education provider and the Medical Director, to ensure that students on the programme would be allowed to evidence these skills on placement and the programme team highlighted that a copy of this agreement could be made available to the visitors. Therefore the visitors require a copy of this agreement to demonstrate that the appropriate assessment methods can be employed while on placement. This is to ensure that students are able to evidence these skills on placement and therefore demonstrate how they meet the learning outcomes associated with the practice placement portfolio.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how to continue the work to provide students with access to relevant IT resources while on placement.

Reason: The visitors noted in discussion with students that remote access to the relevant IT learning resources while on placement was available and that this provision had been enhanced through additional access to Glasgow Caledonian University learning resources. Therefore the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met. However, through further discussion with the students it was noted that the provision of IT facilities while on placement was not universally satisfactory. The visitors noted that the programme team had identified this issue and were working to make sure that all students did have adequate access to IT facilities. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team continue their work to ensure that students have access to appropriate IT facilities while on placement. In this way the programme team may enhance the placement experience for some students of the programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider amending the current consent form to ensure that all aspects of the programme will be appropriately covered.

Reason: From the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors identified that there was a formal procedure in place to gain students' consent for participation in practical and clinical teaching. Therefore the visitors were satisfied that the programme met this standard. However the visitors did articulate that there were some aspects of the programme which may be better covered through the some amendments or additions to the consent form. This included student work with sharps and also any assessment which may include audio-visual recordings of the work undertaken by students. Therefore the visitors recommend that the programme team revisit the consent form to identify where some amendments or additions could be made. This would ensure that the appropriate protocols are used to obtain students' consent for all of the various aspects of the programme.

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 best to continue the work to standardise students' placement experience to ensure that there are not great variations in a cohort's practice placement experience.

Reason: From the documentation provided and from discussions at the visit the visitors were satisfied that the practice placements within the ambulance service were subject to a thorough and effective approval and monitoring system.

However, the visitors noted in discussion with students that there were some significant differences in students' experience while on practice placement. This has led to some students feeling that they have not been afforded the experience they needed while on placement. It was noted in discussion with the practice placement providers and with the programme team that there are a number of issues which influenced the experience that students had while on practice placement which are particular to Scotland and its geography. The visitors also articulated that the programme team had identified these issues and were working to address these issues where they could. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team continue their work to ensure that all students have a satisfactory placement experience. In this way the programme team may be able to enhance the placement experience for some students of the programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how they can continue to support mentors to develop and maintain their professional skills in helping students to demonstrate the required skills while on practice placement.

Reason: The visitors noted in discussion with the practice placement educators that they felt well supported and well prepared by the programme team to mentor students through their period of practice placement. They also noted that all practice placement educators and mentors had to undertake training to supervise a student while on placement. The visitors were therefore satisfied that the programme met this standard. However, the visitors did note that there was no dedicated electronic resource to which the practice placement educators and mentors could refer as and when they needed. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team consider the development of resources, such as a website, which would provide practice placement educators and mentors with an up-to-date resource of pertinent information. In this way the programme team could continue to support practice placement educators and mentors develop and maintain their skills to help students through their period in placement

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider clarifying for students on the programme that some of the skill requirements in the practice portfolio can be met through simulation and not all skills need to be met while on practice placement.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that the progression routes through the programme were clearly specified. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard was met. However, the visitors did note that practice placement portfolio required students to meet a number of learning outcomes by evidencing a wide range of skills. Through discussion with the programme team the visitors established that not all of these skills needed to be demonstrated while on placement and some could be evidenced through simulation. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team ensure that the portfolio makes it clear to students that not all of the skills will need to be

demonstrated while on placement. Through articulating how a student could achieve these skills and progress the programme team may reduce any possible anxiety for a student who may believe that all of the skills identified in the practice placement portfolio had to be demonstrated while on placement.

Susan Boardman
Paul Bates

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University Campus Suffolk
Validating body / Awarding body	Universities of East Anglia and Essex
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality / domain	Diagnostic radiography
Date of visit	16 – 17 March 2011

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	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 'Radiographer' or 'Diagnostic radiographer' 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 25 April 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 May 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 8 April 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 May 2011.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider 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 and validating validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programme – BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology, 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	Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) Russell Hart (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	49
Initial approval	September 2006
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Rosie Doy (University Campus Suffolk)
Secretary	Alison McQuin (University Campus Suffolk)
Members of the joint panel	Sherrie Green (Internal Panel Member) Christine MacKenzie (Internal Panel Member) Dr Andrew Revitt (Internal Panel Member) Carys Horne (External Panel Member) Nigel Rogers (External Panel Member)

	Member) Carol Smith (Internal Panel Member) Kathryn Burgess (Society and College of Radiographers) Jennifer Edie (Society and College of Radiographers)
--	--

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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 rewrite the current consent to role play form to ensure that students can provide fully informed consent.

Reason: The wording on the consent to role play form provided prior to the visit appeared to the visitors to be ambiguous. It was unclear what students were giving consent for and the consequences of not consenting to role play during practice sessions.

At the meeting with the students they said that they were unclear as to whether they had signed forms giving their consent to role play throughout the course of the programme. During the meeting with the programme team, the programme leaders informed the visitors that students signed two consent forms during induction week. As this was a very busy time and the students took so much information on board it was unlikely that the students had any recollection of signing the two consent forms for the programme. The second form gives consent for students to be filmed during practical sessions and the visitors were happy with this form. The programme team told the visitors they have reflected on the consent forms and considered that the form needed revision to ensure any ambiguity in what the students were being asked to consent to was removed. The team also reported that in future all students will be asked to complete the consent forms on an annual basis to ensure that students were fully aware about consent throughout the programme.

Therefore the visitors would like to receive the revised consent to role play form to ensure students can provide fully informed consent throughout each year of their programme of study to ensure that this standard is met.

Martin Benwell
Russell Hart

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University Campus Suffolk
Validating body / Awarding body	Universities of East Anglia and Essex
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology (formerly called BSc (Hons) Oncology and Radiotherapy Technology)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Radiographer
Relevant modality / domain	Therapeutic radiography
Date of visit	16 – 17 March 2011

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	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 'Radiographer' or 'Therapeutic radiographer' 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 25 April 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 May 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 8 April 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 May 2011.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider 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 and validating validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programme – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography, 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	Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) Russell Hart (Therapeutic radiographer)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Mandy Hargood
Proposed student numbers	22
Initial approval	September 2006
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Rosie Doy (University Campus Suffolk)
Secretary	Alison McQuin (University Campus Suffolk)
Members of the joint panel	Sherrie Green (Internal Panel Member) Christine MacKenzie (Internal Panel Member) Dr Andrew Revitt (Internal Panel Member) Carys Horne (External Panel Member) Nigel Rogers (External Panel Member)

	Member) Carol Smith (Internal Panel Member) Kathryn Burgess (Society and College of Radiographers) Jennifer Edie (Society and College of Radiographers)
--	--

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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 rewrite the current consent to role play form to ensure that students can provide fully informed consent.

Reason: The wording on the consent to role play form provided prior to the visit appeared to the visitors to be ambiguous. It was unclear what students were giving consent for and the consequences of not consenting to role play during practice sessions.

At the meeting with the students they said that they were unclear as to whether they had signed forms giving their consent to role play throughout the course of the programme. During the meeting with the programme team, the programme leaders informed the visitors that students signed two consent forms during induction week. As this was a very busy time and the students took so much information on board it was unlikely that the students had any recollection of signing the two consent forms for the programme. The second form gives consent for students to be filmed during practical sessions and the visitors were happy with this form. The programme team told the visitors they have reflected on the consent forms and considered that the form needed revision to ensure any ambiguity in what the students were being asked to consent to was removed. The team also reported that in future all students will be asked to complete the consent forms on an annual basis to ensure that students were fully aware about consent throughout the programme.

Therefore the visitors would like to receive the revised consent to role play form to ensure students can provide fully informed consent throughout each year of their programme of study to ensure that this standard is met.

Martin Benwell
Russell Hart

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Liverpool
Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (D.Clin.Psychol)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Clinical psychologist
Date of visit	23 – 24 February 2011

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	9

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 15 April 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 May 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 6 May 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 7 July 2011.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Harry Brick (Clinical psychologist) Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Lewis Roberts
HPC observer	Paula Lescott
Proposed student numbers	24 per year
Initial approval	1 January 1993
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Julie Walton (University of Liverpool)
Secretary	Janis Paine (University of Liverpool)
Members of the joint panel	Malcolm Adams (British Psychological Society) Margie Callanan (British Psychological Society) Dora Bernardes (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 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 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

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme admissions documentation to include information regarding their accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms 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 accept accreditation of (experiential) learning or use other inclusion mechanisms for potential applicants to the programme. For clarity for potential applicants the visitors require the programme admissions documentation to be revised to clearly include this information.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the current provision of teaching space to ensure that they support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: From the tour of resources the visitors expressed concern that the teaching space currently being utilised by the programme team does not fully support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. The visitors noted comments from the students where they highlighted the inadequacy of the teaching space currently being utilised by the programme team, commenting that they were poorly lit, cold and noisy. The visitors' observations of the teaching space currently being utilised by the programme team support the comments made by the students. The visitors require evidence that the programme team is addressing the issues raised about the quality of the current teaching space and that they are effectively supporting the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the process by which work is marked contains appropriate feedback mechanisms to ensure that students can understand what is expected of them at each stage of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that in discussions with the students it was stated that the assessment feedback mechanisms currently adopted by the programme team can be confusing. The visitors noted that on some pieces of written work the students receive separate feedback from two markers. The students commented that if a piece of work was failed and needed to be resubmitted, it was sometimes difficult to know the exact areas that needed to be addressed and as a result they did not always know what was expected of them at each

stage of the programme. The visitors discussed the issues raised by the students with the programme team. The programme team acknowledged that work was independently marked and variance could occur in feedback. The visitors therefore require evidence that the education provider is reviewing the process by which work is marked to ensure that it is appropriate, as well as the mechanisms it uses to provide students with feedback.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the process by which work is marked allows staff to apply assessment criteria consistently.

Reason: The visitors noted that in discussions with the students it was stated that significant variance sometimes occurred between the marks given from different markers when assessing the same piece of students' written work. The visitors discussed the issues raised by the students with the programme team. The programme team acknowledged that work was independently marked and variance could occur in the marks given by different markers. The education provider must make sure that staff can apply assessment criteria consistently. The visitors require further evidence outlining the mechanisms in place that ensure that assessment criteria are applied consistently by all markers.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to include information that outlines the exit award policy that is in place.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that no mention was made to any exit or step-off awards on the programme. Upon further discussions at the visit it became clear that the education provider does not offer exit awards for this programme. The visitors require the programme documentation to be revised to clearly include this information to ensure that information is clear and accessible to students.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to include information that outlines the aegrotat award policy that is in place.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that no mention was made of aegrotat awards on the programme. Upon further discussions at the visit it became clear that the education provider does not offer aegrotat awards for this programme. The visitors require the programme documentation to be revised to clearly include this information to ensure that information is clear and accessible to students.

6.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for a procedure for the right of appeal for students.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the procedure for the right of appeal for students.

Reason: From a review of the assessment regulations and from discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the education provider has a separate right of appeal procedures for students' studying on taught programmes and students studying on research programmes. Through discussions with the senior management team the visitors noted the changes that had taken place in terms of the programme's position within the education providers' organisational structure. The visitors noted the potential impact this change could have on the right of appeals policies. The visitors require the programme documentation to be revised to clearly specify which right of appeals procedure applies to students on this programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to further enhance the information that is made available to applicants and students about reasonable adjustments and the support services available to individuals with certain 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. The visitors noted that in the discussions with the programme team that they gave a number of examples where reasonable adjustments had been made to support students on the programme. The visitors also noted comments from students where they fed back on the exceptional levels of support available for students with specific health needs. The visitors did, however, note an apparent discrepancy between the discussions with the programme team and students and the information made available within the programme documentation. The visitors felt that information on reasonable adjustments and support mechanisms that the programme team were operating could be made more explicit in the programme documentation to ensure that the options and services available to individuals with health requirements are more clearly and consistently highlighted.

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 noted that the programme team monitors the admissions data that it receives from the Clearing House. The visitors also noted that the education provider gave an example of some engagement work with local schools by which they were attempting to raise the profile of Clinical psychology to currently under-represented groups. The visitors recommend 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.

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 visitors wished to support the education providers' use of multidisciplinary delivery of the taught components of the programme.

Reason: The visitors are satisfied that the learning outcomes of the programme ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (1b) around working with other professions and that multi professional working is an important component of the programme. The visitors noted from discussions with the students that the delivery of sessions by staff from other professions is highly valued. The visitors therefore wished to recommend that the programme team continue with the practise of multi professional delivery throughout the taught components of the programme where appropriate.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider formulating a comprehensive strategy that incorporates service user involvement throughout the duration of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted a number of good examples of service user involvement in the programme, particularly the role of service users in the recruitment and selection of students. The visitors noted discussions with the programme team and service users outlining all the different ways service users were involved in the programme. From the discussions the visitors couldn't see a clear strategy of how the programme team were implementing service users in the curriculum over the course of the programme. The visitors therefore note that the programme team may want to consider integrating service user involvement throughout the duration of the programme and building it into the curriculum to ensure that service users are involved in a joined up and strategic 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 the leadership skills of students throughout the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted discussions with the students, the programme team and the practice placement educators that outlined the importance of students developing leadership skills throughout the programme. The visitors noted a number of examples given by the students that highlighted where they were able to gain good experience of leadership development within a placement setting. The visitors were satisfied that students were able to develop leadership skills whilst on placements. From the discussions the visitors couldn't see a clear strategy of how the programme team were implementing leadership skills throughout the programme and note that the education provider may want to consider developing a strategy that would enhance the current provision offered within placements by developing leadership skills throughout the course of the programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing 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 that outlined the process that a student goes through when drawing up a learning contract when they start a new placement. The visitors also noted discussions with the programme team around the role of the mid-placement review and the importance of this mechanism in ensuring that any gaps in students' clinical experience and professional conduct, highlighted in a previous placement are taken forward. The visitors noted that if any gaps in students' clinical experience and professional conduct, highlighted in a previous placement were not addressed within the learning contract the mid-placement review could be too late in the placement to address these gaps. The visitors therefore note the importance of the learning contract. The education provider should consider reviewing the process by which learning contracts are drawn up and agreed to ensure that students, practice placements and the education provider work collaboratively to 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.

Sabiha Azmi
Harry Brick

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme name	Health Psychology Research and Professional Practice (PhD)
Mode of delivery	Full time and part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Health psychologist
Date of visit	16 – 17 February 2011

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	19
Commendations	20

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programmes. The education provider has until 5 April 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 May 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 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 28 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, however, the education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Gareth Roderique-Davies (Health Psychologist) Lynn Dunwoody (Health Psychologist)
HPC executive officers (in attendance)	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Proposed student numbers	Intake of 1 or 2 per year. 10 over the course of the programme
Initial approval	01/01/2007
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2011
Chair	Peter Smith (University of Southampton)
Secretary	Sean Withill (University of Southampton)
Members of the joint panel	Steve Tee (Internal Panel Member) Rachel Gillibrand (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input 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 37 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 20 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 have also made a commendation. Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft the admissions documentation, including the website information, to illustrate the admissions procedures for criminal conviction checks.

Reason: From discussions with trainees, the visitors noted that criminal conviction checks were not undertaken on application to the programme, rather they were undertaken before the trainee commenced any data collection as part of their research. The trainees confirmed that they did not pay for these checks and assumed that the cost was covered by the education provider. The visitors were concerned that criminal conviction checks were being undertaken once a trainee was on the programme and not as part of the admissions procedures and they were unsure of the processes which would be followed if a criminal conviction was declared. The visitors discussed this with the programme team who confirmed that going forward enhanced criminal conviction checks would be undertaken upon application to the programme and that applicants would be responsible for the cost of the check. To ensure the admissions procedures require criminal conviction checks to be undertaken on application to the programme and that applicants are informed of the process and any costs involved, the visitors would like to see this is reflected in revised admissions procedures.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft the programme documentation, including the website information, to revise and clearly communicate the admissions procedures relating to any health requirements.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors learnt that applicants to the programme were required to undertake an occupational health (OH) assessment. During the visit, the visitors received amendments to the submitted documentation which removed the requirement for an OH assessment on application and outlined revised admissions procedures. The visitors discussed these with the programme team however, to ensure the admissions procedures relating to any health requirements are revised and are clearly communicated to applicants, the visitors would like to receive revised programme documentation (including the website information).

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that work placements are effectively managed.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors were unsure of how work placements were managed. From discussions with the programme team,

the visitors recognised that the primary placement for this programme would be as a PhD student within the Academic Unit (the education provider has recently moved from School to Academic Units). Other placement opportunities existed and these could be within the wider university setting or external to the education provider. The visitors learnt that trainees were responsible for finding their own placements and as part of their application to join the programme, a supervision plan and research proposal would be agreed. It was the role of the Supervisor to monitor that these were being met through their review of monthly reports and an annual review of the Portfolio of competences. The visitors confirmed that the Supervisor was an academic member of staff and that there were no individuals at the work placement responsible for supervising the trainee with the aim of observing and signing off learning outcomes. The visitors were concerned that the Supervisor was reviewing a reflexive piece of work written by the trainee and not observing the trainee within the work placement.

The visitors also learnt that where trainees were PhD students within the Academic Unit or wider university setting, the programme team did not plan to undertake any work placement approval or monitoring functions. These functions would only be undertaken when a trainee was undertaking work placements outside of the education provider.

The education provider has overall responsibility for placement learning and ensuring that suitable systems are in place to support it. The visitors were therefore concerned that, while placements were integral to the programme, the education provider did not approve and monitor all work placements or have the systems in place to objectively assess the trainees while on work placement. In order for this SET to be met, the visitors would like to receive further information on how the programme ensures all work placements are effectively managed.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the resources available to trainees on all work placements are effectively used.

Reason: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. This form sought to determine whether the trainee felt adequately supported. However, the visitors could not determine how the programme team identified what resources the education provider expected to be in place for trainees on work placement or how the programme team then determined whether the resources were effectively used. The visitors could also not determine how the programme team ensured this was the case for work placements in the Academic Unit or wider university setting as these work placements were not subject to approval or monitoring by the programme team. The visitors would therefore like to receive further information about how the education provider ensures that the resources to support student learning are effectively used in all work placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the resources available to trainees on all work placements support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. This form sought to determine whether the trainee felt adequately supported; and that the trainee and workplace contact were aware of the learning outcomes and assessment procedures while on work placement. However, the visitors could not determine how the programme team identified what resources the programme team expected to be in place for trainees on work placement or how the programme team then determined whether the resources effectively supported the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. The visitors could also not determine how the programme team ensured this was the case for work placements in the Academic Unit or wider university setting as these work placements were not subject to approval or monitoring by the programme team. The visitors would therefore like to receive further information about how the education provider ensures that the resources to support student learning are effectively used in all work placements.

3.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that trainees on all work placements have access to adequate facilities to support their welfare and wellbeing.

Reason: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. This form sought to determine whether the trainee felt adequately supported. However, the visitors could not identify what resources or facilities to support welfare and wellbeing the education provider expected to be in place for trainees on work placement or how the education provider then determined whether they were adequate and accessible. The visitors could also not determine how the programme team ensured this was the case for work placements in the Academic Unit or wider university setting as these work placements were not subject to approval or monitoring by the programme team. The visitors would therefore like to receive further information about how the education provider ensures that there are adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of trainees in all settings.

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 ensure that where trainees participate as service users, appropriate protocols are used to obtain their consent.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors learnt that trainees would be participating in role play during the voluntary Cognitive Behaviour Therapy (CBT) module. However they were unable to determine a formal process for obtaining trainee consent within the documentation. From the discussions with the trainees and the programme team, the visitors learnt that verbal consent is obtained during the CBT module and that participation is not mandatory. The programme team also discussed how they made applicants to the programme clear about what level of involvement was expected during the course of the programme.

The visitors were concerned that there was no formal protocol in place to detail how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained or how situations where trainees declined from participation were managed. In light of this, the visitors were not satisfied the programme gained informed consent from trainees or could appropriately manage situations where trainees declined to participate. The visitors therefore require the education provider to implement appropriate formal protocols for obtaining consent from trainees and for managing situations where trainees decline from participating.

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 revise the programme documentation to make explicit how the learning outcomes of the programme allow all trainees to meet the following standards of proficiency (SOPs);

- **1a.1 be able to practise within the legal and ethical boundaries of their profession**
 - **understand the need to act in the best interests of the service users at all times**
 - **understand what is required of them by the Health Professions Council**
 - **understand the need to respect, and so far as possible uphold, the rights, dignity, values and autonomy of every patient including their role in the diagnostic and therapeutic process and in maintaining health and wellbeing**
 - **be aware of current UK legislation applicable to the work of their profession**
 - **understand the complex ethical and legal issues of any form of dual relationship and the impact these may have on clients**
 - **understand the power imbalance between practitioners and clients and how this can be managed appropriately**
- **1a.2 be able to practise in a non-discriminatory manner**

- **1a.6 be able to practise as an autonomous professional, exercising their own professional judgement**
 - know the limits of their practice and when to seek advice or refer to another professional
- **1b.1 be able to work, where appropriate, in partnership with other professionals, support staff, service users and their relatives and carers**
 - understand the need to engage service users and carers in planning and evaluation diagnostics, treatments and interventions to meet their needs and goals
 - be able to make appropriate referrals
- **2b.2 be able to draw on appropriate knowledge and skills in order to make professional judgements**
 - be able to recognise when (further) intervention is inappropriate, or unlikely to be helpful
- **2b.4 be able to conduct appropriate diagnostic or monitoring procedures, treatment, therapy or other actions safely and skilfully**
 - be able to implement psychological interventions appropriate to the presenting problem and to the psychological and social circumstances of the client and / or group
 - be able, on the basis of psychological formulation, to implement psychological therapy or other interventions appropriate to the presenting problem and to the psychological and social circumstances of the client
 - be able to integrate and implement therapeutic interventions based on a range of evidence-based models of formal psychological therapy
 - be able to choose and use a broad range of psychological interventions, appropriate to the client's needs and settings

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors noted the units of competence outlined in the Programme Handbook and Handbook for Workplace Contacts. The visitors discussed how these learning outcomes translated to the SOPs and therefore how the education provider ensured that all trainees met the SOPs. The visitors learnt that trainees were assessed on the 57 competences outlined in the handbooks. The generic professional competence unit contains 7 overarching competences with 41 sub-competences and is assessed via a reflexive report of 3,000 words. The visitors were concerned about the number of sub-competences which the trainees appeared to have to evidence in the reflexive report. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told that trainees only have to evidence the 7 overarching competences. The visitors felt that some of the sub-competences had direct links to the SOPs and therefore while these were outlined in the handbooks, it appeared feasible that a trainee may not receive training or be assessed on these SOPs. The SOPs outlined above are the instances when the visitors felt this was possible. The visitors would therefore like to receive revised documentation which clearly indicates how the programme ensures the above SOPs are met within the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements is in place.

Reason: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. However, as outlined in the conditions against SETs 3.8, 3.9, 3.11, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8, 5.9 and 5.11 the visitors could not identify how the programme team ensured that the work place setting was appropriate; provided the trainee with appropriate resources to support their learning and development; was safe; or was staffed by appropriately qualified and experienced staff. The visitors could also not determine how the programme team ensured this was the case for work placements in the Academic Unit or wider university setting as these work placements were not subject to approval or monitoring by the programme team. The education provider has overall responsibility for placement learning and ensuring that suitable systems are in place to support it. The visitors felt that the current systems did not provide a thorough or effective system to approve and monitor all work placements. To ensure that this SET is met, the visitors would like to receive documentation which illustrates a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all work place settings.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at all work placements to support trainees in their learning in a safe environment.

Reason: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. This form sought to ensure 'the workplace contact is appropriately qualified, registered, and experienced with appropriate knowledge, skills and experience to support the trainee in the learning outcomes identified in the trainee's supervision plan'. However, the visitors could not identify what programme specific knowledge was required of the workplace contact and then how the programme team determined this. The visitors could also not determine how the programme team ensured this was the case for work placements in the Academic Unit or wider university setting as these work placements were not subject to approval or monitoring by the programme team. Therefore the visitors would like to receive documentation which outlines how the education provider ensures that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at all work placement's to support trainees in their learning in a safe environment.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that workplace contacts have relevant, knowledge, skills and experience to support trainees and provide a safe environment for their learning.

Reason: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. This form sought to ensure 'the workplace contact is appropriately qualified, registered, and experienced with appropriate knowledge, skills and experience to support the trainee in the learning outcomes identified in the trainee's supervision plan'. However, the visitors could not identify what programme specific knowledge, skills and experience was required of the workplace contact and then how the programme team determined this. The visitors could also not determine how the programme team ensured this was the case for work placements in the Academic Unit or wider university setting as these work placements were not subject to approval or monitoring by the programme team. Therefore the visitors would like to receive documentation which outlines how the education provider ensures that the workplace contact has the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support trainees and provide a safe environment for their learning in all work placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Reason: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. This form sought to ensure 'the workplace contact is appropriately qualified, registered, and experienced with appropriate knowledge, skills and experience to support the trainee in the learning outcomes identified in the trainee's supervision plan'. However, as outlined in the reasons for SETs 5.6 and 5.7, the visitors could not determine what programme specific knowledge, skills and experience was required of the workplace contact and then how the programme team determined this. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that workplace contacts were not required to undertake any training prior to a trainee starting their work placement. A Handbook for Workplace Contacts had recently been developed and would be provided to all workplace contacts. The visitors felt written support alone could be open to interpretation and therefore not sufficient to ensure consistency of support and approach among the different workplace contacts. The visitors felt that workplace contacts should receive relevant training to ensure that all trainees have as consistent experience as practicably possible when trying to achieve the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require evidence of what the programme team considers appropriate workplace contact training and how the team will check that contacts on work placements meet this requirement in order to show how this SET is met.

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: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. This form sought to ensure 'the workplace contact is appropriately qualified, registered, and experienced with appropriate knowledge, skills and experience to support the trainee in the learning outcomes identified in the trainee's supervision plan'. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured this was the case for work placements in the Academic Unit or wider university setting as these work placements were not subject to approval or monitoring by the programme team. Therefore the visitors would like to receive documentation which outlines how the education provider ensures that the workplace contact is appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed, for all work placements.

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

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that workplace contacts are fully prepared for work placement.

Reason: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. This form sought to ensure that the trainee and the workplace contact were aware of and understood the areas listed within this SET. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that workplace contacts were not required to undertake any training prior to a trainee starting their work placement. However a Handbook for Workplace Contacts had recently been developed and would be provided to all workplace contacts. The visitors felt that written support alone could be open to interpretation and was therefore not sufficient to ensure consistency of support and approach among the different workplace contacts. The visitors therefore require evidence of how the education provider ensures that workplace contacts are appropriately prepared for work placement and that the programme continues to meet this SET.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that clear procedures are in place so that service users are aware that trainees are involved and appropriate consent is gained.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors were unable to determine the procedures in place for trainees to inform service users that they are a trainee health psychologist. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that trainees have to inform service users of their trainee status and gain appropriate consent as soon as they undertake any research. However the visitors also noted that when trainees were on work placement and not undertaking research they were not required by the programme team to inform service users that they were trainees. The visitors felt that service users must be made aware that trainees are involved and gain appropriate consent to respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues. Therefore the visitors require evidence to demonstrate how the programme team make it clear to trainees that they must highlight their trainee status to service users while they are on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to make explicit that where the learning outcomes allow trainees to meet the following SOPs are adequately assessed:

- **1a.1 be able to practise within the legal and ethical boundaries of their profession**
 - understand the need to act in the best interests of the service users at all times
 - understand what is required of them by the Health Professions Council
 - understand the need to respect, and so far as possible uphold, the rights, dignity, values and autonomy of every patient including their role in the diagnostic and therapeutic process and in maintaining health and wellbeing
 - be aware of current UK legislation applicable to the work of their profession
 - understand the complex ethical and legal issues of any form of dual relationship and the impact these may have on clients
 - understand the power imbalance between practitioners and clients and how this can be managed appropriately
- **1a.2 be able to practise in a non-discriminatory manner**
- **1a.6 be able to practise as an autonomous professional, exercising their own professional judgement**

- know the limits of their practice and when to seek advice or refer to another professional
- **1b.1 be able to work, where appropriate, in partnership with other professionals, support staff, service users and their relatives and carers**
 - understand the need to engage service users and carers in planning and evaluation diagnostics, treatments and interventions to meet their needs and goals
 - be able to make appropriate referrals
- **2b.2 be able to draw on appropriate knowledge and skills in order to make professional judgements**
 - be able to recognise when (further) intervention is inappropriate, or unlikely to be helpful
- **2b.4 be able to conduct appropriate diagnostic or monitoring procedures, treatment, therapy or other actions safely and skilfully**
 - be able to implement psychological interventions appropriate to the presenting problem and to the psychological and social circumstances of the client and / or group
 - be able, on the basis of psychological formulation, to implement psychological therapy or other interventions appropriate to the presenting problem and to the psychological and social circumstances of the client
 - be able to integrate and implement therapeutic interventions based on a range of evidence-based models of formal psychological therapy
 - be able to choose and use a broad range of psychological interventions, appropriate to the client's needs and settings

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors noted the units of competence as outlined in the Programme Handbook and Handbook for Workplace Contacts. The visitors discussed how the learning outcomes of the programme translated to the SOPs and therefore how the education provider ensured that all trainees met the SOPs. The visitors learnt that the trainees were assessed on 57 competences as outlined in the handbooks. The generic professional competence unit contains 7 over arching competences with 41 sub-competences and is assessed via a reflexive report of 3,000 words. The visitors were concerned about the number of sub-competences which the trainees appeared to have to evidence in the reflexive report. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told that trainees only have to evidence the 7 over arching competences. This concerned the visitors as they felt that some of the sub-competences had direct links to the SOPs and therefore while they were outlined in the document, it was feasible that a trainee may not receive training or be assessed on some SOPs. The SOPs outlined above are the instances when the visitors felt this was possible.

Therefore in order to ensure that the learning outcomes ensure that all trainees meet all the SOPs the visitors would like to receive revised documentation which clearly indicates how the programme ensures the SOPs outlined above are assessed within the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that professional aspects of practice are integral to the assessment procedures of the work placement.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors were unable to identify the assessment which takes place while trainees are in the work place setting. From discussions with trainees and the programme team, the visitors learnt that all assessment is undertaken by the Supervisor through monthly reflexive reports and an annual review meeting of the Portfolio of competences. The visitors were concerned about the lack of assessment taking place in the work placement. The visitors felt there was therefore no objective assessment of the learning outcomes gained while in the work placement and they could not be sure professional aspects of practice were integral to the work placement assessment. In order for the visitors to be assured that this SET is met, the visitors would like to receive revised information outlining how the assessment procedures measure professional aspects of practice within the work placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the assessment methods employed measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors noted the units of competence as outlined in the Programme Handbook and Handbook for Workplace Contacts. The visitors discussed how the learning outcomes of the programme translated to the SOPs and therefore how the education provider ensured that all trainees met the SOPs. The visitors learnt that the trainees were assessed on 57 competences as outlined in the handbooks. The generic professional competence unit contains 7 over arching competences with 41 sub-competences and is assessed via a reflexive report of 3,000 words. The visitors were concerned about the number of sub-competences which the trainees appeared to have to evidence in the reflexive report. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told that trainees only have to evidence the 7 over arching competences. This concerned the visitors as they felt that some of the sub-competences had direct links to the SOPs and therefore while they were outlined in the document, it was apparently feasible that a trainee may not receive training or be assessed on some SOPs. The SOPs outlined in the conditions against SET 4.1 and 6.1 are the instances when the visitors felt this was possible.

Therefore in order to ensure that the assessment methods employed measure the learning outcomes the visitors would like to receive revised documentation which clearly indicates how the programme ensures the SOPs outlined in the conditions against SET 4.1 and 6.1 are assessed within the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the assessment methods employed appropriately measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors were unable to identify the assessment which takes place while trainees are in the work place setting. From discussions with trainees and the programme team, the visitors learnt that all assessment is undertaken by the Supervisor through monthly reflexive reports and an annual review meeting of the Portfolio of Competences. The visitors were concerned about the lack of assessment taking place in the work placement. The visitors felt there was therefore no objective measurement of how the trainees were meeting the relevant the learning outcomes while on work placement and as such were unclear as to how the programme team were sure that trainees were meeting all of the relevant SOPs. In order for the visitors to be assured that this SET is met, the visitors would like to receive revised information outlining how the assessment methods objectively measure the learning outcomes of the work placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure there are effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure consistency in the assessment of the Portfolio of competences.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt about the processes for trainees to graduate from the MPhil to the PhD and the assessment and monitoring processes in place for this. However the visitors noted that currently there are no internal or external mechanisms in place to review the assessment of the Portfolio of competences, which trainees complete while on work placement, to ensure consistency in marking. The visitors were therefore concerned that the marking of the Portfolio of competences maybe perceived to be inconsistent. As such the visitors felt that this may result in successful academic appeals being lodged and trainees progressing onto the PhD who the programme team may have concerns about. The visitors would therefore like to receive details of the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure consistency of assessment of the Portfolio of competences.

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 revisit the programme documentation to clearly specify that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility for admission onto the Register.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that an aegrotat award would not be conferred to any student exiting this programme.

However, this standard requires that the programme documentation clearly states this to avoid confusion and possible academic appeal. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be updated to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not be conferred and would not provide students with eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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 making the entry requirements relating to English language more easily accessible on the website.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider both before and at the visit, the visitors were satisfied that the admissions procedures applied selection and entry criteria in relation to English language. From the visitor's review of the website, they noted that these requirements were not outlined on the programme specific web pages and to find this information, applicants had to view the international applicant's section of the website. The visitors felt that some applicants may therefore miss the entry requirements relating to English language and would like to recommend that the education providers considers how it can make these requirements more easily accessible to potential applicants to assist in their decision about whether to take up a place on the programme.

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider including within the programme for staff development a need to maintain knowledge about the roles of the regulator and the professional body.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions with the senior and programme teams, the visitors were satisfied that this SET was met. The visitors did note from the various meetings at the visit that there was confusion between the role of the HPC and the British Psychological Society (BPS). The visitors felt that to enhance staff's professional knowledge, the education provider should consider implementing a need to keep knowledge of the regulator and professional body up-to-date.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how it can best make trainees aware of the student complaints process.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there was an appropriate student complaints process in place. From the meeting with trainees, the visitors noted that they were not aware that such a process existed. Trainees did say that if they had any concerns they would raise them with their Supervisor. The visitors felt that to ensure trainees were aware of the process the education provider should consider how it could best inform them of this process.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors would like to commend the programme team on their commitment to providing trainees with opportunities for peer support through the organisation of the Monday lunch time sessions.

Reason: From the discussions with trainees the visitors learnt about the Monday lunch time sessions. These had been designed by the education provider to provide trainees with an additional level of support (in the form of peer support) during their course and were run once per month on a Monday. The Monday lunch time sessions were not previously run outside of term time but following a request from trainees, the programme team increased their frequency to take account of holidays. The visitors were very impressed with this level of commitment and felt that the Monday lunch time sessions were a unique and innovative approach to providing trainees with additional support.

Information about this can be found at

www.soton.ac.uk/psychology/postgraduate/research_degrees/degrees/mphil_phd_health_psychology_research_and_professional_practice_pgr.page

Gareth Roderique-Davies
Lynn Dunwoody

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme name	Health Psychology Research and Professional Practice (MPhil)
Mode of delivery	Full time and part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Health psychologist
Date of visit	16 – 17 February 2011

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	19
Commendations	21

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 5 April 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 May 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 30 June 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 28 August 2011.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event, however, the education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Gareth Roderique-Davies (Health Psychologist) Lynn Dunwoody (Health Psychologist)
HPC executive officers (in attendance)	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Proposed student numbers	Intake of 1 or 2 per year. 10 over the course of the programme
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2011
Chair	Peter Smith (University of Southampton)
Secretary	Sean Withill (University of Southampton)
Members of the joint panel	Steve Tee (Internal Panel Member) Rachel Gillibrand (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HPC did not review the external examiner 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 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 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 34 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 23 SETs.

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

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

The visitors 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 redraft the admissions documentation, including the website information, to provide applicants with information specifically relating to the MPhil programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitors noted that there was limited information regarding the MPhil programme available to applicants. The visitors recognised that this was because the MPhil programme is a step off award from the PhD programme and had not previously been approved in its own right. The visitors felt that in order to provide applicants with sufficient information for them to make an informed choice about the MPhil programme, further details must be available to applicants within the admissions documentation, including in the information on the website.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft the admissions documentation, including the website information, to illustrate the admissions procedures for criminal conviction checks.

Reason: From discussions with trainees, the visitors noted that criminal conviction checks were not undertaken on application to the programme, rather they were undertaken before the trainee commenced any data collection as part of their research. The trainees confirmed that they did not pay for these checks and assumed that the cost was covered by the education provider. The visitors were concerned that criminal conviction checks were being undertaken once a trainee was on the programme and not as part of the admissions procedures and they were unsure of the processes which would be followed if a criminal conviction was declared. The visitors discussed this with the programme team who confirmed that going forward enhanced criminal conviction checks would be undertaken upon application to the programme and that applicants would be responsible for the cost of the check. To ensure the admissions procedures require criminal conviction checks to be undertaken on application to the programme and that applicants are informed of the process and any costs involved, the visitors would like to see this is reflected in revised admissions procedures.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft the programme documentation, including the website information, to revise and clearly communicate the admissions procedures relating to any health requirements.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors learnt that applicants to the programme were required to undertake an occupational health (OH) assessment. During the visit, the visitors received amendments to the submitted documentation which removed the requirement for an OH assessment on application and outlined revised admissions procedures. The visitors discussed these with the programme team however, to ensure the admissions procedures relating to any health requirements are revised and are clearly communicated to applicants, the visitors would like to receive revised programme documentation (including the website information).

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that work placements are effectively managed.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors were unsure of how work placements were managed. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors recognised that the primary placement for this programme would be as a PhD student within the Academic Unit (the education provider has recently moved from Schools to Academic Units). Other placement opportunities existed and these could be within the wider university setting or external to the education provider. The visitors learnt that trainees were responsible for finding their own placements and as part of their application to join the programme, a supervision plan and research proposal would be agreed. It was the role of the Supervisor to monitor that these were being met through their review of monthly reports and an annual review of the Portfolio of competences. The visitors confirmed that the Supervisor was an academic member of staff and that there were no individuals at the work placement responsible for supervising the trainee with the aim of observing and signing off learning outcomes. The visitors were concerned that the Supervisor was reviewing a reflexive piece of work written by the trainee and not observing the trainee within the work placement.

The visitors also learnt that where trainees were PhD students within the Academic Unit or wider university setting, the programme team did not plan to undertake any work placement approval or monitoring functions. These functions would only be undertaken when a trainee was undertaking work placements outside of the education provider.

The education provider has overall responsibility for placement learning and ensuring that suitable systems are in place to support it. The visitors were therefore concerned that, while placements were integral to the programme, the education provider did not approve and monitor all work placements or have the systems in place to objectively assess the trainees while on work placement. In order for this SET to be met, the visitors would like to receive further information on how the programme ensures all work placements are effectively managed.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the resources available to trainees on all work placements are effectively used.

Reason: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. This form sought to determine whether the trainee felt adequately supported. However, the visitors could not determine how the programme team identified what resources the education provider expected to be in place for trainees on work placement or how the programme team then determined whether the resources were effectively used. The visitors could also not determine how the programme team ensured this was the case for work placements in the Academic Unit or wider university setting as these work placements were not subject to approval or monitoring by the programme team. The visitors would therefore like to receive further information about how the education provider ensures that the resources to support student learning are effectively used in all work placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the resources available to trainees on all work placements support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. This form sought to determine whether the trainee felt adequately supported; and that the trainee and workplace contact were aware of the learning outcomes and assessment procedures while on work placement. However, the visitors could not determine how the programme team identified what resources the programme team expected to be in place for trainees on work placement or how the programme team then determined whether the resources effectively supported the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. The visitors could also not determine how the programme team ensured this was the case for work placements in the Academic Unit or wider university setting as these work placements were not subject to approval or monitoring by the programme team. The visitors would therefore like to receive further information about how the education provider ensures that the resources to support student learning are effectively used in all work placements.

3.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that trainees on all work placements have access to adequate facilities to support their welfare and wellbeing.

Reason: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. This form sought to determine whether the trainee felt adequately supported. However, the visitors could not identify what resources or facilities to support welfare and wellbeing the education provider expected to be in place for trainees on work placement or how the education provider then determined whether they were adequate and accessible. The visitors could also not determine how the programme team ensured this was the case for work placements in the Academic Unit or wider university setting as these work placements were not subject to approval or monitoring by the programme team. The visitors would therefore like to receive further information about how the education provider ensures that there are adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of trainees in all settings.

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 ensure that where trainees participate as service users, appropriate protocols are used to obtain their consent.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors learnt that trainees would be participating in role play during the voluntary Cognitive Behaviour Therapy (CBT) module. However they were unable to determine a formal process for obtaining trainee consent within the documentation. From the discussions with the trainees and the programme team, the visitors learnt that verbal consent is obtained during the CBT module and that participation is not mandatory. The programme team also discussed how they made applicants to the programme clear about what level of involvement was expected during the course of the programme.

The visitors were concerned that there was no formal protocol in place to detail how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained or how situations where trainees declined from participation were managed. In light of this, the visitors were not satisfied the programme gained informed consent from trainees or could appropriately manage situations where trainees declined to participate. The visitors therefore require the education provider to implement appropriate formal protocols for obtaining consent from trainees and for managing situations where trainees decline from participating.

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 revise the programme documentation to make explicit how the learning outcomes of the programme allow all trainees to meet the following standards of proficiency (SOPs);

- **1a.1 be able to practise within the legal and ethical boundaries of their profession**
 - understand the need to act in the best interests of the service users at all times
 - understand what is required of them by the Health Professions Council
 - understand the need to respect, and so far as possible uphold, the rights, dignity, values and autonomy of every patient including their role in the diagnostic and therapeutic process and in maintaining health and wellbeing
 - be aware of current UK legislation applicable to the work of their profession
 - understand the complex ethical and legal issues of any form of dual relationship and the impact these may have on clients
 - understand the power imbalance between practitioners and clients and how this can be managed appropriately
- **1a.2 be able to practise in a non-discriminatory manner**
- **1a.6 be able to practise as an autonomous professional, exercising their own professional judgement**
 - know the limits of their practice and when to seek advice or refer to another professional
- **1b.1 be able to work, where appropriate, in partnership with other professionals, support staff, service users and their relatives and carers**
 - understand the need to engage service users and carers in planning and evaluation diagnostics, treatments and interventions to meet their needs and goals
 - be able to make appropriate referrals
- **2b.2 be able to draw on appropriate knowledge and skills in order to make professional judgements**
 - be able to recognise when (further) intervention is inappropriate, or unlikely to be helpful
- **2b.4 be able to conduct appropriate diagnostic or monitoring procedures, treatment, therapy or other actions safely and skilfully**
 - be able to implement psychological interventions appropriate to the presenting problem and to the psychological and social circumstances of the client and / or group
 - be able, on the basis of psychological formulation, to implement psychological therapy or other interventions appropriate to the

presenting problem and to the psychological and social circumstances of the client

- **be able to integrate and implement therapeutic interventions based on a range of evidence-based models of formal psychological therapy**
- **be able to choose and use a broad range of psychological interventions, appropriate to the client's needs and settings**

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors noted the units of competence outlined in the Programme Handbook and Handbook for Workplace Contacts. The visitors discussed how these learning outcomes translated to the SOPs and therefore how the education provider ensured that all trainees met the SOPs. The visitors learnt that trainees were assessed on the 57 competences outlined in the handbooks. The generic professional competence unit contains 7 overarching competences with 41 sub-competences and is assessed via a reflexive report of 3,000 words. The visitors were concerned about the number of sub-competences which the trainees appeared to have to evidence in the reflexive report. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told that trainees only have to evidence the 7 overarching competences. The visitors felt that some of the sub-competences had direct links to the SOPs and therefore while these were outlined in the handbooks, it appeared feasible that a trainee may not receive training or be assessed on these SOPs. The SOPs outlined above are the instances when the visitors felt this was possible. The visitors would therefore like to receive revised documentation which clearly indicates how the programme ensures the above SOPs are met within the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements is in place.

Reason: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. However, as outlined in the conditions against SETs 3.8, 3.9, 3.11, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8, 5.9 and 5.11 the visitors could not identify how the programme team ensured that the work place setting was appropriate; provided the trainee with appropriate resources to support their learning and development; was safe; or was staffed by appropriately qualified and experienced staff. The visitors could also not determine how the programme team ensured this was the case for work placements in the Academic Unit or wider university setting as these work placements were not subject to approval or monitoring by the programme team. The education provider has overall responsibility for placement learning and ensuring that suitable systems are in place to support it. The visitors felt that the current systems did not provide a thorough or effective system to approve and monitor all work placements. To ensure that this SET is met, the visitors would like to receive documentation which illustrates a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all work place settings.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at all work placements to support trainees in their learning in a safe environment.

Reason: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. This form sought to ensure 'the workplace contact is appropriately qualified, registered, and experienced with appropriate knowledge, skills and experience to support the trainee in the learning outcomes identified in the trainee's supervision plan'. However, the visitors could not identify what programme specific knowledge was required of the workplace contact and then how the programme team determined this. The visitors could also not determine how the programme team ensured this was the case for work placements in the Academic Unit or wider university setting as these work placements were not subject to approval or monitoring by the programme team. Therefore the visitors would like to receive documentation which outlines how the education provider ensures that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at all work placement's to support trainees in their learning in a safe environment.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that workplace contacts have relevant, knowledge, skills and experience to support trainees and provide a safe environment for their learning.

Reason: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. This form sought to ensure 'the workplace contact is appropriately qualified, registered, and experienced with appropriate knowledge, skills and experience to support the trainee in the learning outcomes identified in the trainee's supervision plan'. However, the visitors could not identify what programme specific knowledge, skills and experience was required of the workplace contact and then how the programme team determined this. The visitors could also not determine how the programme team ensured this was the case for work placements in the Academic Unit or wider university setting as these work placements were not subject to approval or monitoring by the programme team. Therefore the visitors would like to receive documentation which outlines how the education provider ensures that the workplace contact has the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support trainees and provide a safe environment for their learning in all work placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Reason: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. This form sought to ensure 'the workplace contact is appropriately qualified, registered, and experienced with appropriate knowledge, skills and experience to support the trainee in the learning outcomes identified in the trainee's supervision plan'. However, as outlined in the reasons for SETs 5.6 and 5.7, the visitors could not determine what programme specific knowledge, skills and experience was required of the workplace contact and then how the programme team determined this. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that workplace contacts were not required to undertake any training prior to a trainee starting their work placement. A Handbook for Workplace Contacts had recently been developed and would be provided to all workplace contacts. The visitors felt written support alone could be open to interpretation and therefore not sufficient to ensure consistency of support and approach among the different workplace contacts. The visitors felt that workplace contacts should receive relevant training to ensure that all trainees have as consistent experience as practicably possible when trying to achieve the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require evidence of what the programme team considers appropriate workplace contact training and how the team will check that contacts on work placements meet this requirement in order to show how this SET is met.

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: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. This form sought to ensure 'the workplace contact is appropriately qualified, registered, and experienced with appropriate knowledge, skills and experience to support the trainee in the learning outcomes identified in the trainee's supervision plan'. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured this was the case for work placements in the Academic Unit or wider university setting as these work placements were not subject to approval or monitoring by the programme team. Therefore the visitors would like to receive documentation which outlines how the education provider ensures that the workplace contact is appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed, for all work placements.

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

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that workplace contacts are fully prepared for work placement.

Reason: From the documentation and in discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that a Workplace approval and monitoring form had to be completed for work placements external to the university. This form sought to ensure that the trainee and the workplace contact were aware of and understood the areas listed within this SET. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that workplace contacts were not required to undertake any training prior to a trainee starting their work placement. However a Handbook for Workplace Contacts had recently been developed and would be provided to all workplace contacts. The visitors felt that written support alone could be open to interpretation and was therefore not sufficient to ensure consistency of support and approach among the different workplace contacts. The visitors therefore require evidence of how the education provider ensures that workplace contacts are appropriately prepared for work placement and that the programme continues to meet this SET.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that clear procedures are in place so that service users are aware that trainees are involved and appropriate consent is gained.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors were unable to determine the procedures in place for trainees to inform service users that they are a trainee health psychologist. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that trainees have to inform service users of their trainee status and gain appropriate consent as soon as they undertake any research. However the visitors also noted that when trainees were on work placement and not undertaking research they were not required by the programme team to inform service users that they were trainees. The visitors felt that service users must be made aware that trainees are involved and gain appropriate consent to respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues. Therefore the visitors require evidence to demonstrate how the programme team make it clear to trainees that they must highlight their trainee status to service users while they are on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to make explicit that where the learning outcomes allow trainees to meet the following SOPs are adequately assessed:

- **1a.1 be able to practise within the legal and ethical boundaries of their profession**
 - understand the need to act in the best interests of the service users at all times
 - understand what is required of them by the Health Professions Council
 - understand the need to respect, and so far as possible uphold, the rights, dignity, values and autonomy of every patient including their role in the diagnostic and therapeutic process and in maintaining health and wellbeing
 - be aware of current UK legislation applicable to the work of their profession
 - understand the complex ethical and legal issues of any form of dual relationship and the impact these may have on clients
 - understand the power imbalance between practitioners and clients and how this can be managed appropriately
- **1a.2 be able to practise in a non-discriminatory manner**
- **1a.6 be able to practise as an autonomous professional, exercising their own professional judgement**
 - know the limits of their practice and when to seek advice or refer to another professional
- **1b.1 be able to work, where appropriate, in partnership with other professionals, support staff, service users and their relatives and carers**
 - understand the need to engage service users and carers in planning and evaluation diagnostics, treatments and interventions to meet their needs and goals
 - be able to make appropriate referrals
- **2b.2 be able to draw on appropriate knowledge and skills in order to make professional judgements**
 - be able to recognise when (further) intervention is inappropriate, or unlikely to be helpful
- **2b.4 be able to conduct appropriate diagnostic or monitoring procedures, treatment, therapy or other actions safely and skilfully**
 - be able to implement psychological interventions appropriate to the presenting problem and to the psychological and social circumstances of the client and / or group
 - be able, on the basis of psychological formulation, to implement psychological therapy or other interventions appropriate to the

presenting problem and to the psychological and social circumstances of the client

- **be able to integrate and implement therapeutic interventions based on a range of evidence-based models of formal psychological therapy**
- **be able to choose and use a broad range of psychological interventions, appropriate to the client's needs and settings**

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors noted the units of competence as outlined in the Programme Handbook and Handbook for Workplace Contacts. The visitors discussed how the learning outcomes of the programme translated to the SOPs and therefore how the education provider ensured that all trainees met the SOPs. The visitors learnt that the trainees were assessed on 57 competences as outlined in the handbooks. The generic professional competence unit contains 7 overarching competences with 41 sub-competences and is assessed via a reflexive report of 3,000 words. The visitors were concerned about the number of sub-competences which the trainees appeared to have to evidence in the reflexive report. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told that trainees only have to evidence the 7 overarching competences. This concerned the visitors as they felt that some of the sub-competences had direct links to the SOPs and therefore while they were outlined in the document, it was feasible that a trainee may not receive training or be assessed on some SOPs. The SOPs outlined above are the instances when the visitors felt this was possible.

Therefore in order to ensure that the learning outcomes ensure that all trainees meet all the SOPs the visitors would like to receive revised documentation which clearly indicates how the programme ensures the SOPs outlined above are assessed within the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that professional aspects of practice are integral to the assessment procedures of the work placement.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors were unable to identify the assessment which takes place while trainees are in the work place setting. From discussions with trainees and the programme team, the visitors learnt that all assessment is undertaken by the Supervisor through monthly reflexive reports and an annual review meeting of the Portfolio of competences. The visitors were concerned about the lack of assessment taking place in the work placement. The visitors felt there was therefore no objective assessment of the learning outcomes gained while in the work placement and they could not be sure professional aspects of practice were integral to the work placement assessment. In order for the visitors to be assured that this SET is met, the visitors would like to receive revised information outlining how the assessment procedures measure professional aspects of practice within the work placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the assessment methods employed measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors noted the units of competence as outlined in the Programme Handbook and Handbook for Workplace Contacts. The visitors discussed how the learning outcomes of the programme translated to the SOPs and therefore how the education provider ensured that all trainees met the SOPs. The visitors learnt that the trainees were assessed on 57 competences as outlined in the handbooks. The generic professional competence unit contains 7 over arching competences with 41 sub-competences and is assessed via a reflexive report of 3,000 words. The visitors were concerned about the number of sub-competences which the trainees appeared to have to evidence in the reflexive report. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told that trainees only have to evidence the 7 over arching competences. This concerned the visitors as they felt that some of the sub-competences had direct links to the SOPs and therefore while they were outlined in the document, it was apparently feasible that a trainee may not receive training or be assessed on some SOPs. The SOPs outlined in the conditions against SET 4.1 and 6.1 are the instances when the visitors felt this was possible.

Therefore in order to ensure that the assessment methods employed measure the learning outcomes the visitors would like to receive revised documentation which clearly indicates how the programme ensures the SOPs outlined in the conditions against SET 4.1 and 6.1 are assessed within the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the assessment methods employed appropriately measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors were unable to identify the assessment which takes place while trainees are in the work place setting. From discussions with trainees and the programme team, the visitors learnt that all assessment is undertaken by the Supervisor through monthly reflexive reports and an annual review meeting of the Portfolio of Competences. The visitors were concerned about the lack of assessment taking place in the work placement. The visitors felt there was therefore no objective measurement of how the trainees were meeting the relevant the learning outcomes while on work placement and as such were unclear as to how the programme team were sure that trainees were meeting all of the relevant SOPs. In order for the visitors to be assured that this SET is met, the visitors would like to receive revised information outlining how the assessment methods objectively measure the learning outcomes of the work placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure there are effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure consistency in the assessment of the Portfolio of competences.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that currently there are no internal or external mechanisms in place to review the assessment of the Portfolio of competences, which trainees complete while on work placement, to ensure consistency in marking. The visitors were therefore concerned that the marking of the Portfolio of competences maybe perceived to be inconsistent. As such the visitors felt that this may result in successful academic appeals being lodged and trainees who the programme team may have concerns about. The visitors would therefore like to receive details of the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure consistency of assessment of the Portfolio of competences.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit assessment regulations which clearly specify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team the visitors were unclear of how the assessment regulations applied to trainee progression and achievement within this programme. The visitors recognised that this was because the MPhil programme is a step off award from the PhD programme and had not previously been approved in its own right and as such, documentation had not been submitted prior to the event. In order to meet this SET, the visitors would like to receive confirmation of the assessment regulations which are in place for the MPhil programme in relation to progression and achievement.

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 revisit the programme documentation to clearly specify that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility for admission onto the Register.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that an aegrotat award would not be conferred to any student exiting this programme. However, this standard requires that the programme documentation clearly states this to avoid confusion and possible academic appeal. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be updated to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not be conferred and would not provide students with eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit assessment regulations which clearly specify the requirement 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.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team the visitors were unclear of how the assessment regulations relating to the appointment of the external examiner for this programme. The visitors recognised that this was because the MPhil programme is a step off award from the PhD programme and had not previously been approved in its own right and as such, documentation had not been submitted prior to the event. In order to meet this SET, the visitors would like to receive confirmation of the assessment regulations which are in place for the MPhil programme in relation to appointment of the external examiner.

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 making the entry requirements relating to English language more easily accessible on the website.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider both before and at the visit, the visitors were satisfied that the admissions procedures applied selection and entry criteria in relation to English language. From the visitor's review of the website, they noted that these requirements were not outlined on the programme specific web pages and to find this information, applicants had to view the international applicant's section of the website. The visitors felt that some applicants may therefore miss the entry requirements relating to English language and would like to recommend that the education providers considers how it can make these requirements more easily accessible to potential applicants to assist in their decision about whether to take up a place on the programme.

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider including within the programme for staff development a need to maintain knowledge about the roles of the regulator and the professional body.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions with the senior and programme teams, the visitors were satisfied that this SET was met. The visitors did note from the various meetings at the visit that there was confusion between the role of the HPC and the British Psychological Society (BPS). The visitors felt that to enhance staff's professional knowledge, the education provider should consider implementing a need to keep knowledge of the regulator and professional body up-to-date.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how it can best make trainees aware of the student complaints process.

Reason: From the documentation submitted and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there was an appropriate student complaints process in place. From the meeting with trainees, the visitors noted that they were not aware that such a process existed. Trainees did say that if they had any concerns they would raise them with their Supervisor. The visitors felt that to ensure trainees were aware of the process the education provider should consider how it could best inform them of this process.

Commendations

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

Commendation: The visitors would like to commend the programme team on their commitment to providing trainees with opportunities for peer support through the organisation of the Monday lunch time sessions.

Reason: From the discussions with trainees the visitors learnt about the Monday lunch time sessions. These had been designed by the education provider to provide trainees with an additional level of support (in the form of peer support) during their course and were run once per month on a Monday. The Monday lunch time sessions were not previously run outside of term time but following a request from trainees, the programme team increased their frequency to take account of holidays. The visitors were very impressed with this level of commitment and felt that the Monday lunch time sessions were a unique and innovative approach to providing trainees with additional support.

Information about this can be found at

www.soton.ac.uk/psychology/postgraduate/research_degrees/degrees/mphil_phd_health_psychology_research_and_professional_practice_pgr.page

Gareth Roderique-Davies
Lynn Dunwoody

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Wales, Newport
Validating body / Awarding body	University of Wales
Programme name	MA Art Psychotherapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality / domain	Art therapy
Date of visit	23 – 24 February 2011

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	15

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 'Art therapist' or 'Art psychotherapist' 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 22 April 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 May 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 27 May 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 7 July 2011.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme. The visit also considered a different programme – MA Music Therapy. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report produced by the education provider outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Pauline Etkin (Music therapist) Jennifer French (Music therapist) Susan Hogan (Art therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	16 per cohort once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2011
Chair	Jo Smedley (University of Wales, Newport)
Secretary	David Jacob (University of Wales, Newport)
Members of the joint panel	John Roberts (Internal Panel Member) Andy Smith (Internal Panel Member) Mike Simmons (Internal Panel Member) Carol Sibbett (External Panel Member) Claire Tilotson (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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Supporting commentary and university documentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input 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 did not meet with students; the programme was new so there were no current or past students to meet.

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 44 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 13 SETs.

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further details of the claim limits for Accreditation of Prior Achievement (APA) policies to be used specifically for this programme and ensure programme documentation clearly articulate the details for potential applicants and students.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated education provider wide Accreditation of Prior Achievement (APA) policies would be in place for this programme. The Student handbook for the programme detailed the policy use and indicated the “limit of what may be claimed is 50% of the credit volume of the programme (in exceptional circumstances two thirds)” (Student Handbook, p17-18). The visitors were concerned that with a transfer onto the programme which claimed up to two thirds of the programme content, it may not be able to fully meet the standards of proficiency and professional fitness to practise could not be fully assured. Discussions with the programme team indicated that the APA policies were the same for all programmes at the education provider, however as long as the limit was no less than 50% or two thirds of the programme content, then the programme could have this limit waived in favour of a higher limit. The visitors felt, in the case of this programme, this to be a pertinent change to address the concerns regarding professional fitness to practise. The visitors therefore require further details of how much, and what, of the content of the programme could be claimed through APA policies to ensure the limits stated are suitable for this particular programme. The visitors also require the programme team to ensure programme documentation clearly articulates the APA policies for potential applicants and students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide details of a programme specific business plan.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated the education provider had been planning for this programme for some time; the ‘health and creative arts’ have been designated as ‘priorities for growth’ and the School of Education had developed ‘two complementary strategies’ which have resulted in the creation of the two programmes being approved at the visit (Supporting Commentary November 2010, p4-9). The visitors were aware that at the time of the visit the education provider was undergoing some restructuring which would affect the school the programme was located in. At the time of the visit the programmes were being held in an overarching business plan for the school which was under discussion as a result of the changes. Because of the broad and uncertain plans received, the visitors were unable to fully determine the security of the programme. The visitors require a programme specific ‘business plan’ which details the financial arrangements for the programme, in terms of

resources (physical resources, library resources, equipment, staff resources) and the planned future growth for the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further details of staff in place to deliver the programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included staff CV's and module implementation plans for this programme. After discussion with the programme team it was indicated that along with permanent members of the programme team, they planned to use other individuals who could contribute to the teaching and delivery of the programme from within the School of Education and also from outside of the education provider. The visitors noted that once the programme would be approved there would come a point when all three years of the programme would be running at the same time. The visitors require further information to ensure there is an adequate number of staff in place to effectively deliver the programme. The visitors require details of how each staff member contributes to modules, where persons external to the programme team will be involved in the delivery of the programme and indicative numbers of staff in place in relation to the number of students across the three years of the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further details of the staff in place delivering the programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included staff CV's and module implementation plans for this programme. After discussion with the programme team it was indicated that along with permanent members of the programme team, they planned to use other individuals who could contribute to the teaching and delivery of the programme from within the School of Education and also from outside of the education provider. The visitors require further information regarding the modules and delivering staff to ensure there is an adequate number of staff in place to effectively deliver the programme. The visitors require details of how each staff member contributes to modules and where persons external to the programme team will be involved in the delivery of the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide clear details of the specialist teaching accommodation and associated learning resources that will be in place for this programme.

Reason: The visit included a tour of the facilities to be used for the programme. It was indicated that the final plans for the teaching rooms and spaces for the programme were yet to be confirmed due to the education provider undergoing some restructuring. The tour took the visiting parties round the facilities as they were being used at the time of the visit and described how aspects of the rooms would be changed depending on how the plans would be finalised. There were discussions around the various possibilities for the rooms including aspects of, confidential storage and studio rooms along with how the rooms would be shared between the three cohorts and other programmes at the school. Because of the uncertainties around the final plans for the teaching spaces for the programme the visitors require specific details of the specialist teaching accommodation and associated learning resources that are planned to be put in place for this programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must revise programme documentation to clearly articulate the procedures for supervision, assessment and support at both the education setting and the clinical setting, in terms of the responsibility of each party and any associated processes.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team at the visit, it was unclear how the academic support, pastoral support and supervision arrangements at the education provider and the placement worked with each other and the student when considering there were various people, with differing roles and remits, working in liaison connected to the students (group supervisor, a clinical supervisor, a clinical tutor and a personal tutor).

It was unclear who would hold professional responsibility for assessing the students' clinical practice bearing in mind that there is the possibility of the clinical supervisor at the placement not being an HPC registered arts therapist. Additionally the lines of communication and responsibility for when there are conflicting views over students' performance between the placement, the education provider and the student were unclear.

During discussion the programme team indicated there would be a point of contact for the academic supervisor and the clinical supervisor to both be able to communicate the progress of the student and express when they felt concerns were present. The education provider indicated that it would be through the third person point of contact that the academic and clinical supervisors' assessments of the students' performance and practise would be looked at.

After discussion, the visitors were satisfied the programme team had considered the problems and had made arrangements for a third person to become involved. The visitors were concerned however with how exactly the academic support, pastoral support and supervision arrangements at the education provider and the placement worked with each other and what the roles and remits of each person were. The visitors were concerned how assessment at the education provider and the placement would be linked together and how procedures any disagreements between the two supervisors would be managed. The visitors felt

that there was also the possibility that a student may disagree with one or both of the assessment results and therefore there would need to be a way for their views to be taken into account.

The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to clearly articulate procedures for supervision, assessment and support at both the education setting and the placement setting in terms of the responsibility of each party and any associated processes.

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 programme team must revise the learning outcomes and module specifications to clearly demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were not always able to clearly link the learning outcomes in the module specifications to the standards of proficiency. The module specifications used learning outcomes that were very broad. It was clear that the programme team intended the modules altogether would cover all standards of proficiency however due to the way they had been written the visitors were unclear as to which standards of proficiency were being delivered in particular modules. The visitors, therefore, could not determine how the learning outcomes showed that students who successfully completed the programme would meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. The visitors suggest this condition be looked at alongside the conditions for 4.2, 5.2, 6.1 and 6.5 as they all link closely to the learning outcomes of modules and assessment of those learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the learning outcomes and module specifications to more clearly demonstrate how the learning outcomes were aligned to the standards of proficiency.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the modules reflect the specific skills and knowledge bases of the art therapy profession.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included module specifications which used learning outcomes that were very broad. The visitors were not able to determine how the programme intends to fully reflect modality practises of the profession. In particular the visitors require further evidence of where in the programme certain models of practise are taught and assessed. The visitors were particularly concerned with where 'Group interactive', 'Person centred', 'Studio' and 'Analytical' models are being incorporated into the curriculum. The visitors suggest this condition be looked at alongside the conditions for 4.1, 5.2, 6.1 and 6.5 as they all link closely to the learning outcomes of modules and assessment of those learning outcomes. Therefore the

visitors require further evidence of where in the modules these specific models of practise are being taught and assessed.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the programme reflects the specific skills and knowledge bases of the profession.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included module specifications which used learning outcomes that were very broad. The visitors were not able to determine how the programme intended to fully reflect different skills and knowledge bases in the curriculum. In particular the visitors were concerned with where social psychology, the sociology of health and social-anthropological understandings of health and illness were included within the curriculum. The visitors could not determine where these fundamental interdisciplinary foundations were reflected in the learning outcomes for the programme and where these learning outcomes were assessed. The visitors suggest this condition be looked at alongside the conditions for 4.1, 5.2, 6.1 and 6.5 as they all link closely to the standards of proficiency, the learning outcomes of modules and assessment of those learning outcomes. The visitors require further evidence of where in the modules these specific aspects of social psychology, the sociology of health and social-anthropological understandings of health and illness are being taught and assessed.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further details of how they plan to manage the third year placement experience and support the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included details of the placements which were to run in the second and third years. The module specifications provided, included broad learning outcomes for each module – including the placement clinical studies modules. The visitors considered the final placement to be crucial for assuring the student understands fully the standards of proficiency and to be the last chance for the programme team to assess the students understanding of placement and their fitness to practise. The visitors were unable to determine how the programme team could assure this with the third year placement for two reasons. Firstly, the duration of the third year placement was stated to be, “15 weeks Clinical practice 2 days per week” (Module Specifications, p50) and as such shorter in duration than the second year placement. The visitors considered this to possibly be too short to fully complete an assessment, analysis and treatment of a service user. Secondly, the visitors could not easily determine the standards of proficiency to be assessed at the placement because the learning outcomes in the module specifications were very broad. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the

programme team planned to manage the third year placement and support the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

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

Condition: The programme team must ensure that a modality specific registered person ensures the students' achievement of the learning outcomes and manages the assessment of the students' clinical placements. The programme team must ensure that placement documentation clearly articulates the lines of responsibility for modality specific assessment of students' clinical practice.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team at the visit, it was unclear who held professional responsibility for assessing the students' clinical practice bearing in mind that there was the possibility of the clinical supervisor at the placement not being a modality specific HPC Registrant. During discussion the programme team indicated there would be a point of contact for the academic supervisor and the clinical supervisor to both be able to communicate the progress of the student and express when they felt concerns were present. The education provider indicated that it would be through the third person point of contact that the assessments of the students' clinical performance and practise would be looked at. From discussion, the visitors understood that, if the clinical supervisor was not HPC Registered under the specific modality, then the academic supervisor would be, however the academic supervisor would have no direct contact with the clinical supervisor, contact would occur through the third person point of contact at the education provider. After this discussion the visitors were concerned how professional responsibility for the delivery of learning outcomes and assessment of the students' clinical practice would be held by an HPC Registered modality specific professional when there was no direct link between the two supervisors. The visitors therefore require the programme team to ensure that a modality specific registered person manages the students' achievement of the learning outcomes and the assessment of the students' clinical placements and that placement documentation clearly articulates the lines of responsibility for modality specific assessment of students' clinical practice.

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 programme team must revise the learning outcomes and module specifications to clearly demonstrate how the assessment of learning outcomes

ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were not always able to clearly link the assessment of the learning outcomes in the module specifications to the standards of proficiency. The module specifications used learning outcomes that were very broad and did not provide assessment criteria for summative assessments. It was clear the programme team intended the modules altogether would cover all standards of proficiency however due to the way they had been written the visitors were unclear as to which standards of proficiency were being delivered in particular modules. The student handbook indicated a guidance sheet for each summative assessment would be provided for students which would give details of each assessment including “(f) the learning outcomes to be assessed” (Student Handbook November 2010, p18-19). The guidance sheets were not provided as part of the documentation prior to the visit.

Due to the broad learning outcomes the visitors were unable to determine how the learning outcomes show that students who successfully completed the programme would meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. The visitors felt the guidance sheets would be valuable tools for students especially if they were designed to link the assessment of the learning outcomes to the standards of proficiency. The visitors suggest this condition be looked at alongside conditions for 4.1, 4.2, 5.2 and 6.5 as they all link closely to the learning outcomes of modules and assessment of those learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the module specifications and provide details of the assessments to more clearly demonstrate how the assessments of the learning outcomes were aligned to the standards of proficiency.

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

Condition: The programme team must revise placement documentation to ensure that assessments across placement are conducted consistently and learning outcomes are in line with the standards of proficiency to ensure fitness to practise.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included module specifications and a clinical placement handbook for use by all parties involved in placement. The clinical handbook included copies of all forms that the student and the clinical supervisor would fill in to track and comment on progress through the placement and of meeting the learning outcomes. The module specifications provided, included broad learning outcomes for each module – including the placement clinical studies modules.

From looking at the documentation, the visitors were concerned that it would be difficult for the programme team to maintain a consistent standard of assessment of placements and be able to ensure fitness to practise for three reasons. Firstly, the learning outcomes described in the module specifications were broad and could not be seen to directly relate to standards of proficiency. Secondly, the

placement forms for the supervisor and the student to fill in and track progression had broad areas for focus. Thirdly the visitors had noted it could be possible for the clinical supervisor working with the student at the placement to not be HPC registered under the specific modality. The visitors felt that this could mean that they would not be fully aware of the required HPC standards of proficiency. The combined effect of these three points would be that assessment of practise at the placement could not easily be seen to link to learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency and so fitness to practise may not be fully assured. The visitors suggest this condition be looked at alongside conditions for 4.1, 4.2, 5.2 and 6.1 as they all link closely to the learning outcomes of modules and assessment of those learning outcomes.

In light of this, the visitors were concerned with how the programme team could ensure that assessments against the learning outcomes would be conducted consistently across placements and the standards of proficiency could be linked to the learning outcomes to ensure fitness to practise. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise placement documentation to ensure that assessments across placement are conducted consistently and are in line with the profession specific standards of proficiency (such as by using explicit reference to the standards of proficiency).

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further details of the marking scales to be used specifically for this programme and ensure programme documentation clearly articulate the details for students.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated education provider wide Assessment and Award Regulations 2010-11 policies would be in place for this programme. The regulations detailed the marking scales and indicated that students “must, in addition to achieving a minimum average grade of D5 for a module, achieve at least an E4 in all elements in order to achieve credit” (Assessment and Award Regulations 2010-11, p9). The regulations additionally stated that “Grade E4 shall be a marginal fail grade” (Assessment and Award Regulations 2010-11, p9). The visitors were concerned that if a student should receive a grade of E4 in any one, or in all, aspects of the programme, they might not be able to fully meet the standards of proficiency and professional fitness to practice could not be assured. Discussions with the programme team indicated the Assessment and Award Regulations were the same for all education provider programmes, however, as long as the minimum for a pass mark was no less than the regulations stated, the programme could have this minimum waived in favour of a higher minimum. The visitors felt, in the case of this programme, this to be a pertinent change to address the concerns regarding professional fitness to practice. The visitors therefore require further details of the marking scales to be used specifically for this programme. The visitors also require the programme team to ensure programme documentation clearly articulates the marking scale details for students.

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

Condition: The programme team must revise the module specifications for this programme to correct the inaccuracies of the stated pre-requisite modules required for progression onto particular modules.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included a Module Specification document. The modules detailed were for this programme and also an MA Music Therapy which was being reviewed at this visit. There were some inaccuracies in the pre-requisite modules detailed for each module which made it difficult for the visitors to see where the programmes were being taught conjointly and where they were being taught on their own. For example, 'Theory and Practice of Art Psychotherapy 2' (p20) has both 'Theory and practice of Music Therapy 1' and 'Theory and Practice of Art Psychotherapy 1' as pre-requisite modules although the module is art therapy specific. The visitors require the programme team to revise the module specification documents to ensure corrections are made to the pre-requisites for each module.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team may wish to review and monitor the reading lists for the programme to ensure that they reference current and up to date material.

Reason: From a review of the indicative reading lists the visitors noticed a number of resources listed within these that were not the most recent versions of the texts or that appeared dated. The visitors also noticed that the texts held by the library also included a number of books that again were not the most recent versions or that appeared dated. The visitors noted some of the texts referenced, to be general psychology books which would relate to art therapy however not be wholly art therapy related. The visitors were satisfied this standard was met and realised that once the programme is running the funding for resources such as these will be in place and may increase as the programme grows. The visitors therefore suggest that the programme team use external sources (professional bodies or other education provider programmes) to compare materials and reading lists to help maintain their own references and library stock in the future.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team may wish to review and monitor the balance of the core modality specific content against the infant observation content of the curriculum.

Reason: The visitors were aware that a programme such as this would not usually contain infant observation within the curriculum. The visitors want to advise the programme team that time spent on infant observation could be spent focussing the students towards more core modality specific content; the visitors feel this could be of greater benefit for students on the programme. The visitors suggest that once the programme is running the programme team continue to monitor the effectiveness of the curriculum and make changes where necessary. The visitors also wish the programme team to note that if they do make changes to the curriculum once the programme is running that they will need to inform the HPC of this.

Pauline Etkin
Jennifer French
Susan Hogan

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Wales, Newport
Validating body / Awarding body	University of Wales
Programme name	MA Music Therapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality / domain	Music therapy
Date of visit	23 – 24 February 2011

Contents

Contents	1
Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	15

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 'Music therapist' 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 22 April 2011 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 May 2011. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 27 May 2011. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 7 July 2011.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme. The visit also considered a different programme – MA Art Psychotherapy. The education provider and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report produced by the education provider outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Pauline Etkin (Music therapist) Jennifer French (Music therapist) Susan Hogan (Art therapist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	8 per cohort once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2011
Chair	Jo Smedley (University of Wales, Newport)
Secretary	David Jacob (University of Wales, Newport)
Members of the joint panel	John Roberts (Internal Panel Member) Andy Smith (Internal Panel Member) Mike Simmons (Internal Panel Member) Carol Sibbett (External Panel Member) Claire Tilotson (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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Supporting commentary and university documentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input 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 did not meet with students; the programme was new so there were no current or past students to meet.

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 43 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 14 SETs.

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The programme team must ensure the programme documentation and advertising materials for the programme (including website information) clarify the equivalent musical skill level required for entry to the programme.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit included admissions information which stated the programme entry requirements. This information stated that applicants “without a degree in Music should be proficient to a professional standard with an instrument or voice” (Supporting Commentary, p13). Documentation also included information of the selection and interview procedures which would be provided for those who expressed an interest in applying for the programme. This information was similar to that given in the Supporting Commentary document but did not include the entry requirements for applicants without a degree in music. The visitors understood this as a professional music level was required for entry to the programme for applicants without a music degree. Discussion at the visit with the programme team indicated that a professional music level was not required; applicants would be required to be proficient to the equivalent of a professional standard. The visitors were satisfied with this clarification however felt this to be an important clarification for potential applicants. Therefore the visitors require the programme team to ensure programme documentation, where entry requirements are referred to, clarify the equivalent standard of musicianship needed on first study instruments and harmonic instruments for entry to the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further details of the claim limits for Accreditation of Prior Achievement (APA) policies to be used specifically for this programme and ensure programme documentation clearly articulate the details for potential applicants and students.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated education provider wide Accreditation of Prior Achievement (APA) policies would be in place for this programme. The Student handbook for the programme detailed the policy use and indicated the “limit of what may be claimed is 50% of the credit volume of the programme (in exceptional circumstances two thirds)” (Student Handbook, p17-18). The visitors were concerned that with a transfer onto the programme which claimed up to two thirds of the programme content, it may not be able to fully meet the standards of proficiency and professional fitness to practise could not be fully assured. Discussions with the programme team indicated that the APA policies were the same for all programmes at the education provider, however as long as the limit was no less than 50% or two thirds of the programme content, then the programme could have this limit waived in favour of a higher limit. The

visitors felt, in the case of this programme, this to be a pertinent change to address the concerns regarding professional fitness to practise. The visitors therefore require further details of how much, and what, of the content of the programme could be claimed through APA policies to ensure the limits stated are suitable for this particular programme. The visitors also require the programme team to ensure programme documentation clearly articulates the APA policies for potential applicants and students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide details of a programme specific business plan.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated the education provider had been planning for this programme for some time; the 'health and creative arts' have been designated as 'priorities for growth' and the School of Education had developed 'two complementary strategies' which have resulted in the creation of the two programmes being approved at the visit (Supporting Commentary November 2010, p4-9). The visitors were aware that at the time of the visit the education provider was undergoing some restructuring which would affect the school the programme was located in. At the time of the visit the programmes were being held in an overarching business plan for the school which was under discussion as a result of the changes. Because of the broad and uncertain plans received, the visitors were unable to fully determine the security of the programme. The visitors require a programme specific 'business plan' which details the financial arrangements for the programme, in terms of resources (physical resources, library resources, equipment, staff resources) and the planned future growth for the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further details of staff in place to deliver the programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included staff CV's and module implementation plans for this programme. After discussion with the programme team it was indicated that along with permanent members of the programme team, they planned to use other individuals who could contribute to the teaching and delivery of the programme from within the School of Education and also from outside of the education provider. The visitors noted that once the programme would be approved there would come a point when all three years of the programme would be running at the same time. The visitors require further information to ensure there is an adequate number of staff in place to effectively deliver the programme. The visitors require details of how each staff member contributes to modules, where persons external to the programme team will be involved in the delivery of the programme and indicative numbers of staff in place in relation to the number of students across the three years of the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further details of the staff in place delivering the programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included staff CV's and module implementation plans for this programme. After discussion with the programme team it was indicated that along with permanent members of the programme team, they planned to use other individuals who could contribute to the teaching and delivery of the programme from within the School of Education and also from outside of the education provider. The visitors require further information regarding the modules and delivering staff to ensure there is an adequate number of staff in place to effectively deliver the programme. The visitors require details of how each staff member contributes to modules and where persons external to the programme team will be involved in the delivery of the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide clear details of the specialist teaching accommodation and associated learning resources that will be in place for this programme.

Reason: The visit included a tour of the facilities to be used for the programme. It was indicated that the final plans for the teaching rooms and spaces for the programme were yet to be confirmed due to the education provider undergoing some restructuring. The tour took the visiting parties round the facilities as they were being used at the time of the visit and described how aspects of the rooms would be changed depending on how the plans would be finalised. There were discussions around the various possibilities for the rooms including aspects of practice space, confidential storage, recording rooms and studio rooms along with how the rooms would be shared between the three cohorts and other programmes at the school. Because of the uncertainties around the final plans for the teaching spaces for the programme the visitors require specific details of the specialist teaching accommodation and associated learning resources that are planned to be put in place for this programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must revise programme documentation to clearly articulate the procedures for supervision, assessment and support at both the education setting and the clinical setting, in terms of the responsibility of each party and any associated processes.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team at the visit, it was unclear how the academic support, pastoral support and supervision arrangements at the education provider and the placement worked with each other and the student when considering there were various people, with differing roles and remits, working in liaison connected to the students (group supervisor, a clinical supervisor, a clinical tutor and a personal tutor).

It was unclear who would hold professional responsibility for assessing the students' clinical practice bearing in mind that there is the possibility of the clinical supervisor at the placement not being an HPC registered music therapist. Additionally the lines of communication and responsibility for when there are conflicting views over students' performance between the placement, the education provider and the student were unclear.

During discussion the programme team indicated there would be a point of contact for the academic supervisor and the clinical supervisor to both be able to communicate the progress of the student and express when they felt concerns were present. The education provider indicated that it would be through the third person point of contact that the academic and clinical supervisors' assessments of the students' performance and practise would be looked at.

After discussion, the visitors were satisfied the programme team had considered the problems and had made arrangements for a third person to become involved. The visitors were concerned however with how exactly the academic support, pastoral support and supervision arrangements at the education provider and the placement worked with each other and what the roles and remits of each person were. The visitors were concerned how assessment at the education provider and the placement would be linked together and how procedures for any disagreements between the two supervisors would be managed. The visitors felt that there was also the possibility that a student may disagree with one or both of the assessment results and therefore there would need to be a way for their views to be taken into account.

The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to clearly articulate procedures for supervision, assessment and support at both the education setting and the placement setting in terms of the responsibility of each party and any associated processes.

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 programme team must revise the learning outcomes and module specifications to clearly demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were not always able to clearly link the learning outcomes in the module specifications to the standards of proficiency. The module specifications used learning outcomes that were very broad. It was clear that the programme team intended the modules altogether would cover all standards of proficiency however due to the way they had been written the visitors were unclear as to which standards of proficiency were being delivered in particular modules. The visitors, therefore, could not determine how the learning outcomes showed that students who successfully completed the programme would meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. The visitors suggest this condition be looked at alongside the conditions for 4.2, 5.2, 6.1 and 6.5 as they all link closely to the learning outcomes of modules and assessment of those learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the learning outcomes and module specifications to more clearly demonstrate how the learning outcomes were aligned to the standards of proficiency.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the programme reflects the specific skills and knowledge bases of the profession.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included module specifications which used learning outcomes that were very broad. The visitors were not able to determine how the programme intended to fully reflect different skills and knowledge bases in the curriculum. In particular, the visitors were concerned with where in the programme aspects of diversity and equality, and social, political and cultural perspectives within the therapeutic relationship are included in the curriculum. The visitors suggest this condition be looked at alongside the conditions for 4.1, 5.2, 6.1 and 6.5 as they all link closely to the learning outcomes of modules and assessment of those learning outcomes. The visitors require further evidence of where in the modules these specific aspects of diversity and equality, and social, political and cultural perspectives within the therapeutic relationship are being taught and assessed.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further details of how they plan to manage the third year placement experience and support the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included details of the placements which were to run in the second and third years. The module specifications provided, included broad learning outcomes for each module – including the placement clinical studies modules. The visitors considered the final placement to be crucial for assuring the student understands fully the standards of proficiency and to be the last chance for the programme team to assess the students understanding of placement and their fitness to practise. The visitors were unable to determine how the programme team could assure this with the third year placement for two reasons. Firstly, the duration of the third year placement was stated to be, “15 weeks Clinical practice 2 days per week” (Module Specifications, p50) and as such shorter in duration than the second year placement. The visitors considered this to possibly be too short to fully complete an assessment, analysis and treatment of a service user. Secondly, the visitors could not easily determine the standards of proficiency to be assessed at the placement because the learning outcomes in the module specifications were very broad. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team planned to manage the third year placement and support the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

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

Condition: The programme team must ensure that a modality specific registered person ensures the achievement of the learning outcomes and manages the assessment of the students’ clinical placements. The programme team must ensure that placement documentation clearly articulates the lines of responsibility for modality specific assessment of students’ clinical practice.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team at the visit, it was unclear who held professional responsibility for assessing the students’ clinical practice bearing in mind that there was the possibility of the clinical supervisor at the placement not being a modality specific HPC Registrant. During discussion the programme team indicated there would be a point of contact for the academic supervisor and the clinical supervisor to both be able to communicate the

progress of the student and express when they felt concerns were present. The education provider indicated that it would be through the third person point of contact that the assessments of the students' clinical performance and practise would be looked at. From discussion, the visitors understood that, if the clinical supervisor was not HPC Registered under the specific modality, then the academic supervisor would be, however the academic supervisor would have no direct contact with the clinical supervisor, contact would occur through the third person point of contact at the education provider. After this discussion the visitors were concerned how professional responsibility for the delivery of learning outcomes assessment of the students' clinical practice would be held by an HPC Registered modality specific professional when there was no direct link between the two supervisors. The visitors therefore require the programme team to ensure that a modality specific registered person manages the students' achievements of the learning outcomes and assessment of the students' clinical placements and that placement documentation clearly articulates the lines of responsibility for modality specific assessment of students' clinical practice.

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 programme team must revise the learning outcomes and module specifications to clearly demonstrate how the assessment of learning outcomes ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were not always able to clearly link the assessment of the learning outcomes in the module specifications to the standards of proficiency. The module specifications used learning outcomes that were very broad and did not provide assessment criteria for summative assessments. It was clear the programme team intended the modules altogether would cover all standards of proficiency however due to the way they had been written the visitors were unclear as to which standards of proficiency were being delivered in particular modules. The student handbook indicated a guidance sheet for each summative assessment would be provided for students which would give details of each assessment including "(f) the learning outcomes to be assessed" (Student Handbook November 2010, p18-19). The guidance sheets were not provided as part of the documentation prior to the visit.

Due to the broad learning outcomes the visitors were unable to determine how the learning outcomes show that students who successfully completed the programme would meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. The visitors felt the guidance sheets would be valuable tools for students especially if they were designed to link the assessment of the learning outcomes to the standards of proficiency. The visitors suggest this condition be looked at alongside conditions for 4.1, 4.2, 5.2 and 6.5 as they all link closely to the learning outcomes of modules and assessment of those learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the module specifications and provide details of the assessments to more clearly demonstrate how the

assessments of the learning outcomes were aligned to the standards of proficiency.

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

Condition: The programme team must revise placement documentation to ensure that assessments across placement are conducted consistently and learning outcomes are in line with the standards of proficiency to ensure fitness to practise.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included module specifications and a clinical placement handbook for use by all parties involved in placement. The clinical handbook included copies of all forms that the student and the clinical supervisor would fill in to track and comment on progress through the placement and of meeting the learning outcomes. The module specifications provided, included broad learning outcomes for each module – including the placement clinical studies modules.

From looking at the documentation, the visitors were concerned that it would be difficult for the programme team to maintain a consistent standard of assessment of placements and be able to ensure fitness to practise for three reasons. Firstly, the learning outcomes described in the module specifications were broad and could not be seen to directly relate to standards of proficiency. Secondly, the placement forms for the supervisor and the student to fill in and track progression had broad areas for focus. Thirdly the visitors had noted it could be possible for the clinical supervisor working with the student at the placement to not be HPC registered under the specific modality. The visitors felt that this could mean that they would not be fully aware of the required HPC standards of proficiency. The combined effect of these three points would be that assessment of practise at the placement could not easily be seen to link to learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency and so fitness to practise may not be fully assured. The visitors suggest this condition be looked at alongside conditions for 4.1, 4.2, 5.2 and 6.1 as they all link closely to the learning outcomes of modules and assessment of those learning outcomes.

In light of this, the visitors were concerned with how the programme team could ensure that assessments against the learning outcomes would be conducted consistently across placements and the standards of proficiency could be linked to the learning outcomes to ensure fitness to practise. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise placement documentation to ensure that assessments across placement are conducted consistently and are in line with the profession specific standards of proficiency (such as by using explicit reference to the standards of proficiency).

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further details of the marking scales to be used specifically for this programme and ensure programme documentation clearly articulate the details for students.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated education provider wide Assessment and Award Regulations 2010-11 policies would be in place for this programme. The regulations detailed the marking scales and indicated that students “must, in addition to achieving a minimum average grade of D5 for a module, achieve at least an E4 in all elements in order to achieve credit” (Assessment and Award Regulations 2010-11, p9). The regulations additionally stated that “Grade E4 shall be a marginal fail grade” (Assessment and Award Regulations 2010-11, p9). The visitors were concerned that if a student should receive a grade of E4 in any one, or in all, aspects of the programme, they might not be able to fully meet the standards of proficiency and professional fitness to practice could not be assured. Discussions with the programme team indicated the Assessment and Award Regulations were the same for all education provider programmes, however, as long as the minimum for a pass mark was no less than the regulations stated, the programme could have this minimum waived in favour of a higher minimum. The visitors felt, in the case of this programme, this to be a pertinent change to address the concerns regarding professional fitness to practice. The visitors therefore require further details of the marking scales to be used specifically for this programme. The visitors also require the programme team to ensure programme documentation clearly articulates the marking scale details for students.

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

Condition: The programme team must revise the module specifications for this programme to correct the inaccuracies of the stated pre-requisite modules required for progression onto particular modules.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included a Module Specification document. The modules detailed were for this programme and also an MA Art Psychotherapy which was being reviewed at this visit. There were some inaccuracies in the pre-requisite modules detailed for each module which made it difficult for the visitors to see where the programmes were being taught conjointly and where they were being taught on their own. For example, ‘Theory and Practice of Music Therapy 2’ (p24) has both ‘Theory and practice of Music Therapy 1’ and ‘Theory and Practice of Art Psychotherapy 1’ as pre-requisite modules although the module is music therapy specific. The visitors require the programme team to revise the module specification documents to ensure corrections are made to the pre-requisites for each module.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team may wish to review and monitor the reading lists for the programme to ensure that they reference current and up to date material.

Reason: From a review of the indicative reading lists the visitors noticed a number of resources listed within these that were not the most recent versions of the texts or that appeared dated. The visitors also noticed that the texts held by the library also included a number of books that again were not the most recent versions or that appeared dated. The visitors were satisfied this standard was met and realised that once the programme is running the funding for resources such as these will be in place and may increase as the programme grows. The visitors therefore suggest that the programme team use external sources (professional bodies or other education provider programmes) to compare materials and reading lists to help maintain their own references and library stock in the future.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team may wish to review and monitor the balance of the core modality specific content against the infant observation content of the curriculum.

Reason: The visitors were aware that a programme such as this would not usually contain so much infant observation within the curriculum. While the visitors saw the valuable opportunities this will offer students on the music therapy programme they also saw that the time spent on infant observation could be spent focussing the students towards more modality specific content. The visitors suggest that once the programme is running the programme team continue to monitor the effectiveness of the curriculum and make changes where necessary. The visitors also wish the programme team to note that if they do make changes to the curriculum once the programme is running that they will need to inform the HPC of this.

Pauline Etkin
Jennifer French
Susan Hogan