

Visitors' report

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Name of education provider | Newcastle University |
| Programme name | Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Practitioner psychologist |
| Relevant modality / domain | Educational psychologist |
| Date of visit | 25 – 26 April 2012 |

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 5 June 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 5 July 2012. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 13 July 2012. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 September 2012.

Introduction

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 | Judith Bamford (Educational psychologist) Allan Winthrop (Counselling psychologist) |
| HPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| HPC observer | Jamie Hunt |
| Proposed student numbers | 10 per cohort |
| First approved intake | September 2006 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2012 |
| Chair | Simon Pallett (Newcastle University) |
| Secretary | Simon Meacher (Newcastle University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Andy Allen (British Psychological Society) Liz Malcolm (British Psychological Society) Andrew Richards (British Psychological Society) Molly Ross (British Psychological Society) Sarah Wright (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"/> |
| Programme information: regulations, committee minutes, annual review reports, admission processes, equality and diversity policy, equal opportunities monitoring data | <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 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

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

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

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

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 programme advertising materials to ensure potential applicants have the information they require in order to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated the management of admissions to the programme were undergoing change, “Admission to the programme is currently administered by the CWDC [Children’s Workforce Development Council]. From 2013 this will be administered by the Teaching Agency” (SETs mapping document, SET 2.1). The information provided also included reference to the programme website. To ensure potential applicants have all the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme the visitors require the education provider to update the website to clarify the arrangements in place for the administration of programme admissions.

Documentation and discussion indicated there were no policies for accreditation for prior learning (APL) available for the programme. The visitors considered this to be important information as it could influence an applicant’s decision about whether to apply to the programme and so should be included in advertising materials.

Documentation provided indicated trainees would undergo an Enhanced Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) check. This check “is completed on entry to the programme, prior to any placement activity” (SETs mapping document, SET 2.3). The visitors considered that potential applicants to the programme should be aware of this information before applying to the programme.

The visitors noted the programme documentation included some inconsistencies in regards to the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level needed for applicants whose first language is not English. There were references to the score being 7.5 (SETs mapping document, programme website materials) and 6.5 (programme specification document April 2012). The visitors confirmed with the programme team the required level was 7.5 and therefore require the education provider to revisit the documentation to ensure consistency.

In order to ensure this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to revise the programme documentation and the advertising materials to include the information as noted above and ensure this information will be provided to potential applicants as the management of programme admissions changes to the Teaching Agency.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate the admissions procedures consider health requirements and ensure potential applicants and trainees are fully aware of the requirements of the programme.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated admission processes for the programme did not directly include a check for any health requirements. Upon commencement of the programme trainees are required to sign a code of professional conduct and fitness to practise policy (Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology Programme Handbook 2011-2014, Appendix 4). Discussion indicated the programme team used this policy to ensure trainees would declare any health requirements that may need reasonable adjustments to be made or that could affect their performance on the programme. The visitors noted the admissions procedures did not take account of applicants' health requirements prior to the point of entry to the programme. The visitors also noted potential applicants were not informed of the programmes requirement to sign up to the code of professional conduct and fitness to practise policy prior to accepting an offer of a place on the programme. The visitors articulated admissions processes should consider applicants' health requirements and that before applying to the programme potential applicants should be made aware of programme requirements to adhere to the code of professional conduct and fitness to practise policy. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the admissions procedures include consideration of applicants' health requirements and that demonstrates potential applicants and trainees are fully aware of the requirements of 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 provide evidence of a formal system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: The visitors noted discussions with the programme team outlining how the quality assurance of placements is managed. The evidence provided in the SETs mapping document (for SETs 5.3, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8 and 5.9) and discussions at the visit, satisfied the visitors that the education provider ensures health and safety guidelines are followed at placements; that equality and diversity policies are checked; that placement supervisors at the placement setting are appropriately qualified, experienced, have relevant knowledge and skills, are appropriately registered; and that placement supervisors are checked to ensure they have undertaken appropriate training. The visitors were not however provided with documentary evidence to support these discussions.

The visitors noted strong collaborative links between the education provider and the practice placement providers, including regular visits to placements. It is through these meetings that placement suitability is assured and monitored. The visitors considered a formal documented process for quality assuring placements through the placement meetings would ensure all placements would be quality assured against the same criteria and would demonstrate a thorough and

effective system is in place. The visitors therefore require documentary evidence of a formal system for approving and monitoring all placements.

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 revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that at least one of the external examiners appointed to the programme will be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail regarding the registration status of an external examiner in the external examiner recruitment policy specific to the programme. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements for the programme but need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation (such as the programme specification document and programme regulations) to demonstrate this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider use the HPC's Guidance on conduct and ethics for students to strengthen trainees understanding of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors were satisfied the learning outcomes and the assessment of the learning outcomes ensured trainees understood the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors noted the programme has created a document which includes the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the British Psychological Society (BPS) code of ethics in a framework for the trainees to use when considering how the programme develops them for professional practice (Programme Handbook Appendix 5: Professional proficiency and competence). The visitors felt the programme could strengthen trainees learning by making more direct reference to the HPC's Standards of conduct, performance and ethics and by utilising the HPC's Guidance on conduct and ethics for students.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to further highlight information about the exit awards in place for the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation the programme regulations clearly articulate details about the exit awards available and that they would "not enable the candidate to register with the Health Professions Council nor practise as an educational psychologist" (Programme regulations). The visitors are therefore satisfied this standard is met. The visitors suggest information about the exit awards should be included in the programme documentation that students regularly use (programme handbooks) in order to strengthen students' awareness of the exit awards for the programme.

Judith Bamford
Allan Winthrop

Visitors' report

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Name of education provider | Staffordshire University |
| Programme name | Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Practitioner psychologist |
| Relevant modality / domain | Health psychologist |
| Date of visit | 17 – 18 April 2012 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| Contents | 1 |
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 11 |

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 8 June 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 5 July 2012. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 August 2012. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 September 2012.

Introduction

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

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) Katherine Thirlaway (Health psychologist) |
| HPC executive officer (in attendance) | Lewis Roberts |
| Proposed student numbers | 6 per cohort |
| First approved intake | September 2002 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2012 |
| Chair | Fiona Irvine (Staffordshire University) |
| Secretary | Jackie Campbell (Staffordshire University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Lynn Dunwoody (British Psychological Society) Liz Simpson (British Psychological Society) Lauren Ison (British Psychological Society) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that demonstrates a process in place to ensure academic supervisors undertake continuing professional development to maintain their supervisory skills.

Reason: The visitors noted students on placement were formally supervised by their academic supervisors, who are HPC registered health psychologists. It is the academic supervisor who has overall responsibility for monitoring student progression and achievement. From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that all academic supervisors had undertaken appropriate initial supervisor training. However, the visitors were unable to find evidence of how they maintained supervisory skills through continuing professional development programmes. The visitors therefore require the education provider to outline a process to ensure academic supervisors regularly maintain their supervisory skills.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate within the programme documentation the areas of the programme where attendance is mandatory, what constitutes unacceptable attendance and highlight the consequences of poor attendance.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted the Self Evaluation Document stated “it is made clear to students at induction and in the student handbook that we expect at least 80% attendance at the formal sessions”. During discussions the programme team indicated there was the expectation that students would contact the education provider if they were absent from placement and the education provider would contact a student after three weeks of successive absence from formal sessions. The visitors also noted that the programme documentation stated the ‘professional competence in health psychology’ module is mandatory.

From the evidence provided the visitors did not consider the attendance policy to be fully and clearly communicated to students. The visitors did not consider the statement within the student handbook to fully communicate the attendance policy and did not highlight the areas of the programme where attendance is mandatory, what constitutes unacceptable attendance and highlight the consequences of poor attendance in all settings. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the full attendance policy for students. The education provider must clearly articulate the areas of the programme where attendance is mandatory, what constitutes unacceptable attendance and highlight the consequences of poor attendance.

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 provide evidence to demonstrate the learning outcomes ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet standards of proficiency 1b.1 and 1b.4.

- **1b.1 be able to work, where appropriate, in partnership with other professionals, support staff, service users and their relatives and carers**
 - understand the dynamics present in health professional – client relationships
- **1b.4 understand the need for effective communication throughout the care of the service user**
 - Recognise the need to use interpersonal skills to encourage the active participation of service users
 - Be able to initiate, develop and end a client – practitioner relationship

Reason: In discussion with the programme team it was stated that standards of proficiency 1b.1 and 1b.4 are covered within the ‘professional skills in health psychology’ and ‘behavioural change interventions’ modules. However, from a review of the learning outcomes associated with these modules the visitors were unable to determine that standards of proficiency 1b.1 and 1b.4 are covered. The visitors noted that standards of proficiency 1b.1 and 1b.4 require experience of service user interaction. The visitors reviewed the assessment related guidance document associated with the ‘behavioural change interventions’ module and noted a student could meet the learning outcomes associated with the module assessments without necessarily having the experience of service user interaction. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence that demonstrates the learning outcomes ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet standards of proficiency 1b.1 and 1b.4. The visitors noted that evidence might include details of where the programme incorporates service user interaction in teaching or where students undertake group work with service users.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of a thorough and effective system for approving placements before they are used.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted the Workplace Checklist that students are required to complete prior to undertaking their practice placement. The visitors noted the checklist is used as an audit tool and covers issues such as health and safety. Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted an academic supervisor visits the placement within three months of a student starting the placement and the Workplace Checklist is reviewed at this visit. The visitors were concerned the education provider does not approve the placement until the academic supervisor has visited, and approval was therefore retrospective. In order to determine the

education provider ensures placements are suitable before students commence the placement the visitors require further evidence of a thorough and effective system for approving placements before they are used.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and monitored within practice placements.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted the Workplace Checklist that students are required to complete prior to undertaking their practice placement. The visitors noted the checklist is used as an audit tool and covers issues such as health and safety. However, the visitors could find no evidence of a mechanism in place to ensure that practice placements have equality and diversity policies in place and that they are implemented and monitored. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence outlining how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and monitored within practice placements.

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: The visitors noted students on placement were formally supervised by their academic supervisors, who are HPC registered health psychologists. It is the academic supervisor who has overall responsibility for monitoring student progression and achievement. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors also noted the role of the workplace contact. The workplace contact is responsible for monitoring student attendance whilst they are on placement and completing a quarterly report that comments on student conduct and performance. From discussions with workplace contacts and students the visitors noted the importance of the role, with some workplace contacts providing significant advice, support and guidance. The visitors commented that support offered by the workplace contact could impact on student progression and therefore considered it imperative the education provider has in place criteria for the selection of workplace contacts. The visitors require details of the criteria in place for the selection of workplace contacts to ensure they have relevant, knowledge, skills and experience to support trainees and provide a safe environment for their learning.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure workplace contacts undertake appropriate training to support them in their role.

Reason: The visitors noted students on placement were formally supervised by their academic supervisors, who are HPC registered health psychologists. It is the academic supervisor who has overall responsibility for monitoring student progression and achievement. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors also noted the role of the workplace contact. The workplace contact is responsible for monitoring student attendance whilst they are on placement and completing a quarterly report that comments on student conduct and performance. From discussions with workplace contacts and students the visitors noted the importance of the role, with some workplace contacts providing significant advice, support and guidance. The visitors commented that the support offered by the workplace contact could impact on student progression and therefore considered it imperative the education provider ensures workplace contacts undertake training to support them in their role. The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure workplace contacts undertake appropriate training to support them in their role.

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 provide evidence that demonstrates how the assessment strategy and design ensures those who successfully complete the programme meet standards of proficiency 1b.1 and 1b.4.

- **1b.1 be able to work, where appropriate, in partnership with other professionals, support staff, service users and their relatives and carers**
 - understand the dynamics present in health professional – client relationships
- **1b.4 understand the need for effective communication throughout the care of the service user**
 - Recognise the need to use interpersonal skills to encourage the active participation of service users
 - Be able to initiate, develop and end a client – practitioner relationship

Reason: In discussion with the programme team it was stated that standards of proficiency 1b.1 and 1b.4 are assessed within the ‘professional skills in health psychology’ and ‘behavioural change interventions’ modules. However, from a review of the learning outcomes associated with these modules the visitors were unable to determine that standards of proficiency 1b.1 and 1b.4 are assessed within the programme. The visitors noted that standard of proficiency 1b.1 and 1b.4 require experience and understanding of service user interaction. The visitors also reviewed the assessment related guidance document associated with the ‘behavioural change interventions’ module and noted a student could meet the learning outcomes associated with the module assessments without necessarily having the experience or the understanding of service user interaction. The visitors therefore require the education provider to give evidence that demonstrates how the assessment strategy and design ensures those who successfully complete the programme meet standards of proficiency 1b.1 and 1b.4.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how the assessment of placement is objective and ensures fitness to practise.

Reason: The visitors noted students on placement were formally supervised by their academic supervisors, who are HPC registered health psychologists. It is the academic supervisor who has overall responsibility for monitoring student progression and achievement. The academic supervisor meets with students three times whilst on placement. These meetings can, if necessary, include the observation of students in practise. From the programme documentation the visitors noted the main assessment tool used by academic supervisors for placements was reviewing student's reflective logs. The visitors were concerned that reviewing reflective work without any validation of the reflection (for example, through scheduled observations) could result in students that are not fully fit to practise. The visitors therefore considered the assessments were not an objective measure of student performance and would not fully ensure fitness to practice. The visitors require further evidence of how the assessment of placement ensures fitness to practise to determine 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 amending the programme website to further highlight the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) standard for entry to the programme and to highlight the currency of BPS Stage 1 qualification that is acceptable to qualify for entry onto the programme.

Reason: From a review of the Self Evaluation Document the visitors noted the IELTS standard for entry to the programme is 7. Through discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied this standard is communicated to students at admissions and is outlined within the Programme Specification. However, the visitors noted the IELTS standard is not included on the programme website. The visitors recommend the education provider consider including this information. The visitors also noted the admissions criteria within the Programme Specification where it was stated applicants to the programme must have “completed British Psychological Society Stage 1 training in Health Psychology. That is either a BPS accredited MSc in Health Psychology with a grade of merit (or 60% average) or above, or the BPS Stage 1 qualification in health psychology with a grade of 60% or more”. In discussion with the programme team it was stated applicants must have usually completed the Stage 1 qualification within the last five years. This information was not included on the programme website. For clarity the visitors recommend the education provider should include this information on the programme website.

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 the visitors noted the admissions procedures take into consideration equality and diversity and the programme team monitors equality and diversity data and so are satisfied this standard has been met. However, the visitors recommend 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 the work currently being undertaken around equality and diversity is conducted in a consistent, transparent and measured way.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider constructing and documenting a formal process that demonstrates how they guarantee and monitor the quality of teaching from specialist visiting lecturers.

Reason: From discussions the visitors noted mechanisms utilised by the programme team to quality assure the teaching of specialist visiting lecturers. Examples included senior management approving the use of a visiting lecturer and students providing feedback after the session. The visitors recommend the education provider may want to construct and document a formal process to demonstrate how they guarantee and monitor the quality of teaching from specialist visiting lecturers. The visitors suggest the programme team may want to identify specific learning to be delivered, review content and resources for currency, peer review sessions and provide formal evaluation.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider amending the placement audit processes to include records of further evidence, action plan areas for development and monitor progress during the academic supervisor visit.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted the Workplace Checklist students are required to complete prior to undertaking their practice placement. The visitors noted the checklist is used as an audit tool and covers issues such as health and safety. Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted an academic supervisor visits the placement within three months of a student starting placement and the Workplace Checklist is reviewed at this visit. The visitors noted the Workplace Checklist contains a number of yes or no questions and does not give scope to record detailed audit information. The visitors also noted there is no guidance in place to outline what is acceptable evidence and what constitutes non-compliance. The visitors recommend the education provider should amend the placement audit processes to record further evidence, to action plan areas for development and to monitor progress against the audit criteria during the academic supervisor visit. The visitors suggest this would make the Workplace Checklist more detailed and more useful as a 'living' document. The visitors also recommend the education provider consider using the standards of education and training in SET 5 as an audit framework.

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 the collaborative arrangements in place between themselves and the practice placement providers to further enhance links.

Reason: From evidence provided the visitors noted the main collaboration for workplace contacts occurs when academic supervisors visit students on placement. The visitors noted comments from workplace contacts stating they could contact the programme team at any point if they had a question or concern. From this evidence the visitors were satisfied the education provider works with practice placement providers and communication happens in both directions.

Given the potential for geographically dispersed placements and the defined role of the workplace contact the visitors commented there is a risk that collaboration may at times be limited. The visitors therefore recommend the education provider should review the collaborative arrangements in place between themselves and the practice placement providers to try and further enhance links.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should encourage workplace contacts to frame any comments about student profession-related conduct around the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The visitors noted students on placement were formally supervised by their academic supervisors, who are HPC registered health psychologists. It is the academic supervisor who has overall responsibility for monitoring student progression and achievement. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors also noted the role of the workplace contact. The workplace contact is responsible for monitoring student attendance whilst they are on placement and completing a quarterly report that comments on student conduct and performance. The visitors noted the quarterly report pro forma asks “during this period of time have you had any concerns about the student’s ability to perform his or her role”. The visitors noted the standards associated with a student undertaking their role as an employee or volunteer may differ from those expected of a student health psychologist. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider encourage workplace contacts to frame any comments about profession-related conduct around the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Sabiha Azmi
Katherine Thirlaway

Visitors' report

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Name of education provider | University of Central Lancashire |
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Physiotherapist |
| Date of visit | 24 – 25 April 2012 |

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 'Physiotherapist' 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 19 June 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 5 July 2012. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 3 August 2012. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 September 2012.

Introduction

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 management and resources, curriculum 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 validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy part time 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 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 part time programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist) Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance) | David Christopher |
| Proposed student numbers | 25 per cohort once a year |
| First approved intake | September 2005 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2012 |
| Chair | Janice Wardle (University of Central Lancashire) |
| Secretary | Suzanne Juniper (University of Central Lancashire (UCLAN)) |
| Members of the joint panel | Robin Richardson (Internal Panel Member) Julie Cummings (Internal Panel Member) Tracey McGlone (External Panel Member) Liz Hancock (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists (CSP)) Nina Patterson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) |

Sources of evidence

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

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme specification | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Descriptions of the modules | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Joint HPC approval, CSP accreditation and UCLAN validation event appendices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

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

The visitors 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.

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 ensure that the programme advertising material published on the education provider's website is updated and provides comprehensive information for potential applicants to make an informed choice about whether to apply for or take up a place on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that the programme handbook included useful information about costs associated with the programme. However, it was not clear how potential applicants would receive this information. In addition, the visitors also noted that the programme website did not make sufficiently clear to potential applicants that fees for the programme would be paid by the Department of Health and the availability of a means tested bursary. Visitors also noted an incorrect reference on the website to the requirement for registration with the Vetting and Barring Scheme. In discussions with the programme team the visitors were informed that information about associated costs was made known to all applicants in presentations at open days and as part of the application process. The programme team also confirmed that the website was under development. The visitors therefore require the education provider to update the programme website to ensure that it provides comprehensive and up to date information that will assist potential applicants to decide whether to apply for or take up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide a revised set of module descriptors which demonstrate how the programme's learning outcomes ensure that all those who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors considered the mapping document which provided evidence about where the standards of proficiency (SOPs) were covered in the programme. Discussions with the programme team revealed the need to amend the learning outcomes and assessment methods for some of the modules as a result of the education provider's validation process. The visitors were particularly concerned about module PU1005 Physiotherapeutic Skills, which they considered key in meeting standard 2b.4 be able to conduct appropriate diagnostic or monitoring procedures, treatment, therapy or other actions safely and skilfully. It was not evident to the visitors how the content and learning outcomes for this module would ensure that this standard will be met. Because some of the module descriptors would change as a result of the education provider's validation process, this made it difficult for the visitors to gain an overview of how the learning outcomes for the programme would ensure that all the SOPs were met. The visitors therefore need to see a revised set of module descriptors for the

programme, which demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that all those who complete the programme meet all the SOPs.

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 provide a revised set of module descriptors which demonstrate how the programme's assessment methods ensure that all those who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency.

Reason: The visitors noted that the SOPs mapping document provided prior to the visit referred to a Common Assessment Tool used by five education providers in the North West of England to assess clinical practice. This tool had been mapped against the SOPs and, as a result, the SOPs mapping document provided prior to the visit included a statement that 'Therefore the assessment of Physiotherapy practice provides evidence for ALL SoPs and this is not indicated against each SoP in this proforma'. However, from a review of the module descriptors and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were concerned about how the programme ensured that all students had met the SOPs and, in particular, standard 2b.4 'be able to conduct appropriate diagnostic or monitoring procedures, treatment, therapy or other actions safely and skilfully'. In discussion of the module descriptors the visitors were unclear how the proposed forty five minute practical assessment for module PU1005 'Physiotherapeutic Skills (Neuromusculoskeletal)' could ensure that all the required learning objectives, and hence relevant SOPs, for this module had been demonstrated. The programme team explained that the proposed practical assessment would validate skills by sampling them and that students would be expected to prepare to be assessed on the full range of skills relevant to this module. The visitors require further evidence as to how the assessment would ensure that standard 2b.4 was fully demonstrated. Because some of the module descriptors would change as a result of the education provider's validation process, this made it difficult for the visitors to gain an overview of how the programme would ensure that all those who completed it successfully would meet the SOPs. The visitors therefore need to see a revised set of module descriptors for the programme, which demonstrate how the assessment methods ensure that all the SOPs are met by those who complete the programme.

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 include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy specific to the programme. The education provider provided further documentation relating to its

external examiner system. However, it was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register. The visitors were satisfied that there was a system of external examiners in place and were content with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Joanna Jackson
Fleur Kitsell

Visitors' report

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Name of education provider | University of Central Lancashire |
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Physiotherapist |
| Date of visit | 24 – 25 April 2012 |

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 'Physiotherapist' 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 19 June 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 5 July 2012. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 3 August 2012. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 September 2012.

Introduction

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 management and resources, curriculum 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 validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy part time 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 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 part time programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist) Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance) | David Christopher |
| Proposed student numbers | 25 per cohort once a year |
| First approved intake | September 2005 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2012 |
| Chair | Janice Wardle (University of Central Lancashire) |
| Secretary | Suzanne Juniper (University of Central Lancashire (UCLAN)) |
| Members of the joint panel | Robin Richardson (Internal Panel Member) Julie Cummings (Internal Panel Member) Tracey McGlone (External Panel Member) Liz Hancock (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists (CSP)) Nina Patterson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) |

Sources of evidence

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

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme specification | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Descriptions of the modules | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Joint HPC approval, CSP accreditation and UCLAN validation event appendices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

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

The visitors 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.

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 ensure that the programme advertising material published on the education provider's website is updated and provides comprehensive information for potential applicants to make an informed choice about whether to apply for or take up a place on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that the programme handbook included useful information about costs associated with the programme. However, it was not clear how potential applicants would receive this information. In addition, the visitors also noted that the programme website did not make sufficiently clear to potential applicants that fees for the programme would be paid by the Department of Health and the availability of a means tested bursary. Visitors also noted an incorrect reference on the website to the requirement for registration with the Vetting and Barring Scheme. In discussions with the programme team the visitors were informed that information about associated costs was made known to all applicants in presentations at open days and as part of the application process. The programme team also confirmed that the website was under development. The visitors therefore require the education provider to update the programme website to ensure that it provides comprehensive and up to date information that will assist potential applicants to decide whether to apply for or take up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide a revised set of module descriptors which demonstrate how the programme's learning outcomes ensure that all those who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors considered the mapping document which provided evidence about where the standards of proficiency (SOPs) were covered in the programme. Discussions with the programme team revealed the need to amend the learning outcomes and assessment methods for some of the modules as a result of the education provider's validation process. The visitors were particularly concerned about module PU1005 Physiotherapeutic Skills, which they considered key in meeting standard 2b.4 be able to conduct appropriate diagnostic or monitoring procedures, treatment, therapy or other actions safely and skilfully. It was not evident to the visitors how the content and learning outcomes for this module would ensure that this standard will be met. Because some of the module descriptors would change as a result of the education provider's validation process, this made it difficult for the visitors to gain an overview of how the learning outcomes for the programme would ensure that all the SOPs were met. The visitors therefore need to see a revised set of module descriptors for the

programme, which demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that all those who complete the programme meet all the SOPs.

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 provide a revised set of module descriptors which demonstrate how the programme's assessment methods ensure that all those who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency.

Reason: The visitors noted that the SOPs mapping document provided prior to the visit referred to a Common Assessment Tool used by five education providers in the North West of England to assess clinical practice. This tool had been mapped against the SOPs and, as a result, the SOPs mapping document provided prior to the visit included a statement that 'Therefore the assessment of Physiotherapy practice provides evidence for ALL SoPs and this is not indicated against each SoP in this proforma'. However, from a review of the module descriptors and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were concerned about how the programme ensured that all students had met the SOPs and, in particular, standard 2b.4 'be able to conduct appropriate diagnostic or monitoring procedures, treatment, therapy or other actions safely and skilfully'. In discussion of the module descriptors the visitors were unclear how the proposed forty five minute practical assessment for module PU1005 'Physiotherapeutic Skills (Neuromusculoskeletal)' could ensure that all the required learning objectives, and hence relevant SOPs, for this module had been demonstrated. The programme team explained that the proposed practical assessment would validate skills by sampling them and that students would be expected to prepare to be assessed on the full range of skills relevant to this module. The visitors require further evidence as to how the assessment would ensure that standard 2b.4 was fully demonstrated. Because some of the module descriptors would change as a result of the education provider's validation process, this made it difficult for the visitors to gain an overview of how the programme would ensure that all those who completed it successfully would meet the SOPs. The visitors therefore need to see a revised set of module descriptors for the programme, which demonstrate how the assessment methods ensure that all the SOPs are met by those who complete the programme.

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 include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy specific to the programme. The education provider provided further documentation relating to its

external examiner system. However, it was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register. The visitors were satisfied that there was a system of external examiners in place and were content with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Joanna Jackson
Fleur Kitsell

Visitors' report

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Name of education provider | University of Central Lancashire |
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of delivery | Part time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Physiotherapist |
| Date of visit | 24 – 25 April 2012 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Contents | 1 |
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendation | 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 'Physiotherapist' 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 19 June 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 5 July 2012. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 3 August 2012. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 September 2012.

Introduction

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 management and resources, curriculum 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 validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy full time 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 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 full time programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist) Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance) | David Christopher |
| Proposed student numbers | A maximum of 5 each year |
| First approved intake | September 2008 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2012 |
| Chair | Janice Wardle (University of Central Lancashire (UCLAN)) |
| Secretary | Suzanne Juniper (University of Central Lancashire) |
| Members of the joint panel | Robin Richardson (Internal Panel Member) Julie Cummings (Internal Panel Member) Tracey McGlone (External Panel Member) Liz Hancock (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists (CSP)) Nina Patterson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapists) |

Sources of evidence

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

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme specification | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Descriptions of the modules | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Joint HPC approval, CSP accreditation and UCLAN validation event appendices | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

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

The visitors 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.

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 ensure that the programme advertising material published on the education provider's website is updated and provides comprehensive information for potential applicants to make an informed choice about whether to apply for or take up a place on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that the programme handbook included useful information about costs associated with the programme. However, it was not clear how potential applicants would receive this information. Visitors also noted an incorrect reference on the website to the requirement for registration with the Vetting and Barring Scheme. In discussions with the programme team the visitors were informed that information about associated costs was made known to all applicants in presentations at open days and as part of the application process. The programme team also confirmed that the website was under development. The visitors therefore require the education provider to update the programme website to ensure that it provides comprehensive and up to date information that will assist potential applicants to decide whether to apply for or take up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide a revised set of module descriptors which demonstrate how the programme's learning outcomes ensure that all those who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors considered the mapping document which provided evidence about where the standards of proficiency (SOPs) were covered in the programme. Discussions with the programme team revealed the need to amend the learning outcomes and assessment methods for some of the modules as a result of the education provider's validation process. The visitors were particularly concerned about module PU1005 Physiotherapeutic Skills, which they considered key in meeting standard 2b.4 be able to conduct appropriate diagnostic or monitoring procedures, treatment, therapy or other actions safely and skilfully. It was not evident to the visitors how the content and learning outcomes for this module would ensure that this standard will be met. Because some of the module descriptors would change as a result of the education provider's validation process, this made it difficult for the visitors to gain an overview of how the learning outcomes for the programme would ensure that all the SOPs were met. The visitors therefore need to see a revised set of module descriptors for the programme, which demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that all those who complete the programme meet all the SOPs.

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 provide a revised set of module descriptors which demonstrate how the programme's assessment methods ensure that all those who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency.

Reason: The visitors noted that the SOPs mapping document provided prior to the visit referred to a Common Assessment Tool used by five education providers in the North West of England to assess clinical practice. This tool had been mapped against the SOPs and, as a result, the SOPs mapping document provided prior to the visit included a statement that 'Therefore the assessment of Physiotherapy practice provides evidence for ALL SoPs and this is not indicated against each SoP in this proforma'. However, from a review of the module descriptors and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were concerned about how the programme ensured that all students had met the SOPs and, in particular, standard 2b.4 'be able to conduct appropriate diagnostic or monitoring procedures, treatment, therapy or other actions safely and skilfully'. In discussion of the module descriptors the visitors were unclear how the proposed forty five minute practical assessment for module PU1005 'Physiotherapeutic Skills (Neuromusculoskeletal)' could ensure that all the required learning objectives, and hence relevant SOPs, for this module had been demonstrated. The programme team explained that the proposed practical assessment would validate skills by sampling them and that students would be expected to prepare to be assessed on the full range of skills relevant to this module. The visitors require further evidence as to how the assessment would ensure that standard 2b.4 was fully demonstrated. Because some of the module descriptors would change as a result of the education provider's validation process, this made it difficult for the visitors to gain an overview of how the programme would ensure that all those who completed it successfully would meet the SOPs. The visitors therefore need to see a revised set of module descriptors for the programme, which demonstrate how the assessment methods ensure that all the SOPs are met by those who complete the programme.

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 include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy specific to the programme. The education provider provided further documentation relating to its external examiner system. However, it was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register. The visitors were satisfied that there was a system of external

examiners in place and were content with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendation

4.6 The delivery of the programme must support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how it will ensure that students on this programme have an opportunity to develop the knowledge and skills relevant to continuing professional development covered in the module 'Issues in Professional Practice 1' at a relevant stage in the programme.

Reason: The visitors were content that this standard was met. However, from a consideration of the programme documentation provided prior to the visit they noted that the module 'Issues in Professional Practice 1' played an important role in developing knowledge and skills relating to the recording and use of evidence for continuing professional development and thereby supported the development of autonomous and reflective thinking. The programme handbook indicated that students on the full time programme would take this module in Year 1, but those on the part time programme would not take the module until Year 2 and the visitors sought clarification as to the logic of this sequencing. The programme team noted the apparent anomaly and undertook to give further consideration to this issue. The visitors suggested that the programme team give consideration to how students on this programme could develop knowledge and skills relevant to continuing professional development at an appropriate stage on the programme, which would support the development of autonomous and reflective thinking.

Joanna Jackson
Fleur Kitsell

Visitors' report

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Name of education provider | University of East London |
| Programme name | Professional Doctorate in Counselling Psychology |
| Mode of delivery | Part time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Practitioner psychologist |
| Relevant modality / domain | Counselling psychologist |
| Date of visit | 17 – 18 April 2012 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| Contents | 1 |
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 23 |

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 12 June 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 5 July 2012. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 28 September 2012. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 4 December 2012.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner 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 | Allan Winthrop (Counselling psychologist) Nicola Bowes (Forensic psychologist) |
| HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance) | David Christopher |
| HPC observer | Paula Lescott |
| Proposed cohort number | 26 per cohort once a year |
| First approved intake | January 2004 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2012 |
| Chair | Dave Rowley (University of East London) |
| Secretary | Eno Udoumoren (University of East London) |
| Members of the joint panel | Owen Hughes (British Psychological Society) Ray Woolfe (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"/> |
| Business Plan - professional training in the School of Psychology | <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 28 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 29 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.

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider prior to the visit did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. The programme documentation stated that the programme was 'validated' and 'accredited' by the HPC. The HPC 'approves' programmes. The programme specification stated that "Chartered Counselling Status enables people to work as Counselling Psychologists". However, all students need to apply to the HPC Register after they have successfully completed an approved programme in order to use the protected title. The visitors require the education provider to revise all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

2.1 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 potential applicants are made fully aware of all costs associated with the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider provided little information about costs associated with the programme, for example, relating to the indemnity insurance required for practice placements, the need to pay for personal therapy and possibly also for clinical supervision. Discussions with students revealed that they had received some information about such matters, but greater clarity on the likely costs involved would be beneficial. Discussions with the programme team revealed that this information had previously been included in a programme leaflet, but this was no longer made available to applicants. Consequently, the programme team sought to make applicants aware of such costs during the application process. In order for potential applicants to have clear information about all costs associated with the programme, to inform decisions about applying for and accepting a place on the programme, the visitors require the education provider to revise the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure that potential applicants are made fully aware of all costs associated with the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the admissions procedures and programme documentation to clearly articulate the procedures for criminal convictions checks for the programme.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included information about the education provider's institution-wide Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) procedures and the need for applicants and students to disclose criminal convictions. The programme handbook (p155) stated that the programme team would consult the HPC and education provider's institution-wide policy in the case of a disclosure prior to making decisions, but did not clearly indicate the procedure in place, or who would make the decision. In discussions, the programme team indicated that offers had been withdrawn when convictions were disclosed and the procedures by which such cases would be considered. In order to ensure that this standard continues to be met the visitors require the education provider to provide evidence of the formal processes in place for dealing with an applicant who discloses a criminal conviction or a situation where the CRB status of a student changes as they progress through the programme. The visitors also require the programme documentation to be revised to make it clear that decisions about entry to the programme rest with the education provider, not the HPC.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the admissions procedures and programme documentation to articulate clearly the level of Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks required of applicants and students and to ensure that terminology used is up to date.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included information about the education provider's institution-wide CRB procedures and the need for applicants and students to disclose criminal convictions. However, although the institution-wide documentation stated that enhanced disclosure was required for the programme, this was not indicated clearly in the programme documentation. There was also an out of date reference to 'police checks' in the programme handbook. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be revised to ensure that the level of disclosure required is clear and to ensure that the terminology used is up to date.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the admissions procedures and programme documentation to set out the health requirements for entry to the programme and the procedure for dealing with health issues.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included information about the education provider's institution-wide health screening procedure and the need for applicants to disclose any health issues. However, no clear health requirements were set out in the programme documentation and there was no information

about how health issues would be addressed. Visitors noted that the institution-wide procedures did not require applicants for the programme to undertake health screening. Discussions with the programme team revealed that a health screening questionnaire was being developed for the programme with the intention of using this during the application process. The programme handbook (p155) stated that the programme team would consult the HPC and education provider's institution-wide policy in the case of a health disclosure prior to making decisions, but did not clearly indicate the procedure in place, or who would make the decision.

In order that the health requirements for entry to the programme are made clear to applicants, the visitors require the admissions procedures and programme documentation to be revised. The documentation should set out the health requirements, the procedures for handling health issues and make it clear that decisions about entry to the programme rest with the education provider, not the HPC.

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 revise the admissions procedures and programme documentation to articulate clearly the scheme for the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) or other inclusion mechanisms that are in place for programme entry.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that, while the website and programme handbook indicated that applicants could apply to enter stages of the programme and be admitted through an accreditation procedure, there was no detailed information about the scheme. Discussions with the programme team revealed that such cases were rare, but when they occurred the team considered how prior experience mapped onto the programme's learning outcomes and determined an appropriate entry point. In order to meet this standard, information about AP(E)L should be clearly articulated to potential applicants. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the admissions procedures and programme documentation to explain the process in place.

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

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

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included a business plan for the School of Psychology indicating the education provider's ongoing support for the programme. This support was reiterated in the visitors' discussions with senior managers. However, as noted in the condition against SET 3.5, the visitors were concerned about the level of staffing for the programme and in particular the ability of the programme team to continue to provide support to students and to proactively plan the development of the programme. In addition, as noted in the conditions relating to SET 5, the visitors had concerns about the

ability of the programme team to approve and monitor practice placements, to provide training to practice placement educators and to ensure that students and practice placement educators were prepared for placements. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the programme's secure place in the business plan. This is to ensure that resources to develop the programme, to provide support for students and to manage practice placements effectively are in place and available to the programme team. In this way the visitors can be sure that the programme is secure and that this standard can be met.

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 provide further detailed information about the staffing levels for the programme so that the visitors can be assured there is an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit and discussions with the programme team, senior team and students, the visitors could not fully determine the staff resources that were in place for the programme. It was clear that there were full and part time members of the programme team, though there was uncertainty about the level of staffing (full time equivalent) that was in place.

The visitors noted several concerns raised in the programme documentation and through discussions at the visit in relation to staff resources. In particular, there had been a period of long term illness of one member of staff and the absence of a dedicated research director that had caused difficulties for the programme team. Students on the programme indicated concerns with the level of staff resources in relation to clinical supervision groups being too large and the pressure that staff were under resulting in inconsistency in the level of support available. Discussions with the senior team indicated that the programme team were supported by members of staff from other areas of the School and from external lecturers, and that measures were in place to provide additional cover when required. The visitors noted the education provider's requirement for the double marking of assessments. The visitors also noted that, because the practice placement coordinator held a part time contract, this limited their ability to visit practice placement providers and educators.

The visitors noted the efforts made by the programme team to ensure that students had a positive experience on the programme and were well supported. However, given the lack of clarity around staffing levels the visitors were concerned about the ability of the programme team to sustain the level of support provided and to run and develop the programme effectively. In addition, the visitors noted that the programme leader was planning a sabbatical period, which the education provider would need to manage to ensure that the programme team remains sufficiently resourced to run the programme effectively. The visitors therefore require clarification from the education provider concerning the staffing levels of the programme, to include details of the full and part time members of the programme team and their allocated areas of responsibility across the programme. The education provider should also provide information on any additional staffing resources (from the School and external sources) that are in place to support the delivery of an effective programme. The education provider

should detail how the staffing levels are reviewed in relation to the number of students on the programme and the education provider's strategy for ensuring that an adequate number of staff is in place to deliver the programme effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the staff development policy in place that demonstrates that staff have the opportunity to develop and maintain their professional skills.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit stated that members of the programme team were encouraged to maintain their professional profiles and were supported through staff development. Discussions with senior managers revealed that the education provider had a staff development policy as part of its staff performance review procedure. Visitors also noted that a new 'portfolio model' was being developed that would provide a number of protected hours for staff development, but that this was initially being trialled elsewhere in the School. Discussions with the programme team revealed that they found it difficult to take advantage of staff development opportunities, given the demands on their time arising from the programme and the fact that a number of them had part time contracts. The visitors require evidence of the staff development policy in place for the staff in relation to this programme that ensures that they have the opportunity to develop and maintain their professional skills.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure that all references to HPC are clear, accurate and up to date.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit and noted errors, inaccuracies and ambiguities in the terminology used and references made to the HPC and HPC publications. The programme handbook referred to 'membership' of the HPC (p154). There were a number of statements in the programme documentation such as 'HPC codes of ethics and conduct' and 'HPC standards of professional practice', which were inaccurate and unclear. The HPC has standards of conduct, performance and ethics and standards of proficiency. In addition, there was reference to the level of attendance expected of students in the assessment handbook, which incorrectly implied that the HPC expects students to attend at least 80% of a programme. There were also references to HPC documentation which were unclear, for example 'in line with HPC (2006) requirements' (placement and personal and professional development handbook) and 'ensure you are 'fit to practise' (HPC 2008)'. The visitors considered such references to be inaccurate and potentially misleading to students, and therefore require the documentation to be revised to remove any instances of incorrect, inaccurate or out of date terminology and references throughout.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the student support systems in place for the programme including the allocation of personal tutors to students, frequency of tutorials and the amount of time allocated to personal tutorials throughout the programme.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included information about the academic and pastoral support systems in place on the programme and the visitors noted that each student was allocated a personal, research and clinical skills tutor. Discussions with students revealed that the programme team was considered to be very supportive, but that there was some variability in the levels of support offered to students, possibly as a result of the staffing levels on the programme. Given the lack of clarity around staffing levels the visitors were concerned about the ability of the programme team to sustain the level of support provided and to run and develop the programme effectively. Discussions with the programme team revealed that staff devoted a lot of time and effort to supporting students, but inevitably their ability to meet all the demands placed upon them was limited. The visitors were concerned about the demands placed on the programme team in supporting students on a programme that involved practice placements, academic work and research elements, and hence about the sustainability and consistency of the support systems. The visitors therefore require further information about the student support systems in place, the allocation of students to personal tutors and the amount of time allocated to personal tutorials so they can be assured that student support is sustainable and can be delivered consistently.

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

Condition: The programme documentation must be revised to articulate clearly the process in place for obtaining student consent, including the procedures when consent is withheld.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included a consent form to be completed by students. Discussions with students revealed that they were familiar with and used this form. The programme team explained that it was made clear during the application process that students were expected to participate as service users and the consent form was sent out with offers. Discussions with the programme team also explored the steps that were taken if a student wished to withhold consent for a particular session or more generally. The programme team gave examples of how they dealt with such requests. The visitors noted the steps that the programme team took to deal with such cases. The visitors require the processes to be clearly documented so that students understand the procedures. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the documentation to set out the process in place, how cases where consent is withheld are dealt with and how they ensure that all relevant areas of the programme are covered in such cases.

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 revise the programme documentation to set out clearly the procedures for identifying and addressing concerns about profession-related conduct.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included information about the education provider's 'University and Programme Suitability' and 'Fitness to Practice' procedures (placement and personal and professional development handbooks). Throughout the programme documentation there were references to professional behaviour and various codes of conduct. In discussions with senior management and the programme team the visitors noted that there were a series of engagements and remedial steps which the programme team, in liaison with practice placement providers and educators (as appropriate), conducted before instituting the formal procedures outlined in the documentation. The visitors require these steps to be articulated clearly in the documentation so that all parties understand how such cases are handled throughout. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the programme documentation in order to set out the measures that are taken to address profession-related conduct, including how the measures are applied, how decisions are made and by whom.

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 revise the programme documentation to clearly set out the procedures for identifying and addressing concerns about profession-related conduct, including ensuring that references to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and guidance on conduct and ethics for students are clear and accurate within this process.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted inaccurate references to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics throughout. The programme handbook states that "trainees will be excluded from the Programme if they are found to be in breach of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics". The assessment handbook includes a statement that "The standards of conduct, performance and ethics (BPS and HPC) expected of you underpin personal and professional development and form the basis of trainees learning agreements". However, the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics apply to registrants and those applying to the register, but not to students. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clearly articulate the profession-related conduct procedures and to ensure that references to the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and guidance on conduct and ethics for students are clear and accurate throughout.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit indicated that the following standard of proficiency had been flagged as not applicable by the programme team: **3a.1** understand the structure and function of the human body, relevant to their practice, together with knowledge of health, disease, disorder and dysfunction. At the visit the visitors pointed out that this standard was required of practitioner psychologists and needed to be evidenced. Discussions with the programme team revealed that there had been misunderstanding about the focus of this standard and that it was possible to provide evidence of where this standard was covered in the programme.

In addition, the evidence provided for standards of proficiency **2b.1** be able to conduct service evaluations and **2b.4** be able to conduct consultancy had indicated where students were given an understanding of these standards but had not provided evidence of where they could demonstrate their ability to meet them. In discussions, the visitors noted some examples where the programme provided sessions on consultation skills and service evaluation that had not been clearly identified in the documentation sent out prior to the visit. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme's learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet these standards of proficiency to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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

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

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted references to various codes of conduct throughout. As already identified in the condition for SET 3.16 a number of references to HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were inaccurate and need to be revised to avoid any confusion. The documentation provided prior to the visit also flagged up modules where reference to the standards were included. Discussions with students and the programme team indicated that there were specific sessions which focussed on ethics and in particular HPC standards and their application, which had not been evidenced in the documentation provided. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to identify how the education provider ensures that students on the programme understand the implications of the HPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence relating to practice placements to articulate clearly how they are integral to and integrated throughout the programme.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included a placement and personal professional development handbook. The programme handbook also included references to the practice placements. However, the level of collaboration and interaction with practice placement providers and educators was unclear, as was the extent to which they were encouraged to contribute to the development of the programme. Discussions with practice placement providers and educators revealed that those present were located close to the education provider, some had completed the programme themselves and many had longstanding relationships with the programme. They felt that there was a great deal of informal contact with the programme team and the opportunity to express views about the programme. Discussions with the programme team revealed that practice placements were integral to the programme and that the practice placement coordinator played an active role in liaising with and meeting placement providers and educators. However, it was not clear to the visitors that there were clearly articulated procedures to underpin the place of practice placements in the programme, or to ensure a consistent level of interaction with all practice placement providers and educators (including new providers or those located further from the education provider). The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence relating to practice placements to show how they are integral to the programme.

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 revise the programme documentation relating to practice placements to articulate clearly the number, duration and range of placements necessary to achieve the learning outcomes for the programme.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included a placement and personal professional development handbook, which included information about the minimum number of hours of supervised practice and requirements about the areas to be covered. The placement and personal professional development handbook also stated the type of practice placements that students might get in Years 1 and 2 and stated that students should have at least two practice placements over the 4 years to ensure breadth of training. However, the information was fragmented and it was difficult for the visitors to gain a clear understanding of the requirements relating to the placements that students must undertake. Discussions with practice placement providers and educators revealed at least one instance of a student remaining on the same placement for the entire programme.

The visitors require the education provider to clearly articulate the requirements relating to practice placements and set out clearly the requirements relating to the number, duration and range of practice placements that students must

undertake in order to achieve the programme's learning outcomes. This should include information of the client groups, formats and modalities that are minimum requirements for placements on the programme and therefore how the education provider ensures that the standards of proficiency are met through the placement experience.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that sets out the process for approving and monitoring practice placements to ensure they provide a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included statements that required students to have access to their practice placement provider's health and safety policy. In addition, the Client Work Registration Form, which must be signed by the practice placement coordinator, asked whether the placement had a health and safety policy. However, the procedures through which the education provider monitored the existence and accessibility of such policies were unclear to the visitors. Discussions with the programme team and placement providers and educators revealed interaction between the education provider and practice placement providers and educators, including visits to potential new practice placement providers to assess the suitability of potential placements, which was not articulated in the documentation provided. In the absence of clearly documented procedures for checking the implementation of such policies the visitors could not be certain that a robust monitoring system was in place. The visitors therefore require further evidence that sets out how the education provider ensures that practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

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

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

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included a placement and personal and professional development handbook, which provided some information concerning the organisation and management of practice placements within the programme. This document also included registration forms for practice placement educators. The programme handbook also indicated that a students' personal and professional development registration must be approved by the placement co-ordinator before any supervised clinical practice hours could be recorded, including the countersigning of the client work registration form by the practice placement coordinator. However, the visitors could not find a clearly articulated explanation of the procedures for approving practice placements before a student starts each placement. Discussions with students and practice placement educators indicated that the education provider liaised regularly with participants to gain feedback on practice placements. It was evident that good relationships and regular contact had been developed with longstanding practice placement providers, although the arrangements for dealing with newer placement providers and educators were less evident. Discussions with the

programme team and practice placement coordinator revealed the steps taken to approve new placements, including visits, and the attention paid to feedback in order to monitor the ongoing quality of practice placements. However, the procedures described were not clearly set out in the documentation. Furthermore, it was not evident whether any checks, including visits, would be carried out for practice placements unless concerns had been raised by a student. The visitors could not be certain that the system was robust and therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence that clearly states that the education provider takes overall responsibility for the placements on the programme, including the measures taken to approve and monitor practice placements, in order to ensure that a thorough and effective system is in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure that equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and monitored within practice placements.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included statements that required students to have access to their practice placement provider's equality and diversity policies. However, it was unclear how the education provider monitored whether such policies were in place and whether students had access to them. Discussions with the programme team indicated that if students raised concerns in this area these would be followed up with the practice placement provider, but it was not clear that the existence and implementation of such policies would be checked in the absence of any student concerns. In the absence of a clearly articulated procedure for checking the implementation of such policies visitors could not be certain that a robust system was in place. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence that clearly states how the education provider ensures that equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and monitored within practice placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence outlining how they ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff is in place in all practice placement settings.

Reason: The placement and personal and professional development handbook provided some information about the levels of supervision that a student must ensure were met. The programme handbook also included information about the ratio for supervision required by the education supervisor. The client work registration form, which the practice placement coordinator must countersign, also included a series of questions relating to arrangements for clinical supervision. Discussions with students and practice placement educators revealed that the programme's placement coordinator was proactive in addressing concerns raised by students about supervision and that the programme prepared students for practice placements through a session about

what students should expect in terms of supervision. Discussions with the programme team demonstrated that the practice placement coordinator was in contact with practice placement educators and addressed issues as and when they arose. However, the documentation did not accurately or fully reflect the practice as described to visitors and it was unclear that any checking of levels of supervision would be conducted unless an issue was raised by a student. The visitors were unclear as to how the programme team ensures that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place at each practice placement. As such the visitors could not determine what criteria are used to decide if a practice placement has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff or any process for dealing with a practice placement that does not meet these criteria. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence that states how the education provider ensures an adequate number of appropriate staff at all practice placements.

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

Condition: The programme team must revise the programme documentation to provide evidence of how they ensure practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation included varying descriptions of the knowledge, skills and experience required of practice placement educators. For example, the placement and personal and professional development handbook stated 'It is expected that trainees will be mainly supervised by Counselling Psychologists, who hold chartered membership with the BPS...and are registered with the HPC' and 'Supervisors of trainees...must be practising Counselling or Clinical Psychologists registered with the HPC'. However, the programme handbook stated 'Each trainee must have a clinical supervisor who is a Chartered Counselling Psychologist/HPC registered psychologist with two years post qualification experience or, if this is not possible, a Chartered Clinical Psychologist with two years post qualification experience'. The visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence to ensure that the programme's requirements of practice placement educators are clearly and consistently articulated. Evidence should also be provided of how the education provider uses its approval and monitoring systems to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the arrangements they use to ensure that all practice placement educators receive training, including refresher training, on the particular requirements of the programme in advance of receiving students.

Reason: The visitors noted that the placement and personal and professional development handbook included guidance for placement managers and educators. However, from the documentation provided prior to the visit it was not evident that there was a regular mandatory programme of training for new or

existing practice placement educators. Discussions with practice placement educators revealed that this was the case, but the programme's practice placement coordinator had regular informal liaison with practice placement educators. Most practice placement educators present felt that this system worked very well. Some said they would value the opportunity to meet up with colleagues, although they accepted that finding the time to do so would be difficult. However, the visitors noted some uncertainty amongst the practice placement educators present about the number of reports required from them for each placement and when these should be completed. Visitors also noted that those present had longstanding links with the programme and were located close to the education provider. It was therefore unclear what measures were in place to ensure that all practice placement educators were clear about the programme's requirements. Discussions with the programme team revealed that the education provider had previously offered training events, but had ceased to do so because take up had been poor. The practice placement coordinator now worked with placement educators to ensure that they were kept informed and up to date about the requirements of the programme. This usually took the form of telephone discussions or face to face meetings, although visits may be made to potential new practice placement providers and educators. The visitors noted the programme team's concerns about attendance at training events, however all practice placement educators must undertake educator training appropriate to the programme, including updates on any changes that are being introduced. The visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence of the arrangements that are in place to ensure that all practice placement educators, whether longstanding or new, are informed and kept up to date about the programme's requirements.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation relating to practice placements to set out clearly and consistently the requirements for practice placement educators and the steps taken to ensure that supervision for each student is undertaken by an HPC registered counselling psychologist for at least one practice placement in the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation included varying descriptions of the knowledge, skills and experience required of practice placement educators. For example, the placement and personal and professional development handbook stated 'It is expected that trainees will be mainly supervised by Counselling Psychologists, who hold chartered membership with the BPS...and are registered with the HPC' and 'Supervisors of trainees...must be practising Counselling or Clinical Psychologists registered with the HPC'. However, the programme handbook stated 'Each trainee must have a clinical supervisor who is a Chartered Counselling Psychologist/HPC registered psychologist with two years post qualification experience or, if this is not possible, a Chartered Clinical Psychologist with two years post qualification experience'. The programme team explained that students and practice placement providers and educators were told that the preference was for supervision to be conducted by counselling psychologists registered with the HPC, but that it was only possible to achieve this in approximately 60% of cases. Where it was not possible to ensure that supervision was conducted by a counselling

psychologists registered with the HPC, supervision would be undertaken by a registered clinical psychologist. Discussions with students demonstrated that they were aware of the preference for clinical supervision to be conducted by counselling psychologists. However, from discussions with the programme team, the visitors were unclear about any measures in place to prevent a student from undertaking all practice placements without receiving supervision by a registered counselling psychologist. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to ensure that the programme's requirements for practice placement educators are clearly and consistently articulated and that sets out the means by which the education provider will ensure that no student is able to complete all practice placements throughout the programme without being supervised by a registered counselling psychologist.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the measures that are in place to ensure regular and effective collaboration with practice placement providers.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation provided prior to the visit included statements about the interaction between practice placement providers and the practice placement coordinator to support students' development and identify any concerns. However, it was not clear that there was a system in place, for example regular meetings between the education provider and practice placement providers and educators. The practice placement providers and educators whom the visitors met all felt they had sufficient contact with the programme team and were able to contribute to the programme's development. Discussions with the programme team revealed that the practice placement coordinator liaised with practice placement providers, but that contact was tailored to individual needs rather than there being a standardised procedure in place. The programme team also indicated practice placement providers were able to provide informal feedback on the programme and many did so. In the absence of clearly documented procedures for ensuring regular and effective collaboration with practice placement providers, including set requirements about the frequency and timings of contact, the visitors could not be certain that this standard continued to be met. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence about the measures that are in place to ensure that there is regular and effective collaboration with practice placement providers.

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

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about the steps taken to ensure that students, practice placement providers and educators are fully prepared for practice placements.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included the placement and personal and professional development handbook, which provided students and practice placement providers and educators with information about practice placements. Discussions with students revealed that there were some helpful sessions about supervision and practice placements which were not apparent in the documentation provided. Practice placement providers and educators also stated that there was good ongoing contact with the programme team through the practice placement coordinator, although there was no formal training. However, it was difficult for the visitors to gain a clear understanding of the number, duration and range of placements that students must undertake. The programme documentation provided no information about the training provided for practice placement educators and the process for ensuring that they understood the learning outcomes to be achieved, how student performance was monitored and student progression determined was unclear. In addition, the steps taken to ensure that practice placement educators are kept informed of changes to the programme were not evident. The visitors were therefore unable to make a clear judgement on whether students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placements. The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates that students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placements in terms of the learning outcomes to be achieved, the number, duration and range of placement experiences, the assessment procedures and the communication and lines of responsibility within 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 demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency for counselling psychologists.

Reason: In line with the visitors' concerns that are noted against SET 4.1, the visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit indicated that the following standard of proficiency had been flagged as not applicable by the programme team: **3a.1** 'understand the structure and function of the human body, relevant to their practice, together with knowledge of health, disease, disorder and dysfunction.' In addition, the evidence provided for standards of proficiency **2b.1** be able to conduct service evaluations and standard **2b.4** be able to conduct consultancy had indicated where students were given an understanding of these proficiencies, but had not provided evidenced of where they could demonstrate their ability to meet them. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme's assessment strategy and design ensures that students who complete the programme meet these standards of proficiency to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to set out clearly the arrangements that are in place for ensuring effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are in place in relation to practice placement assessments.

Reason: The programme documentation provided general information about practice placements and the role of practice placement educators. However, the visitors were unclear about arrangements for ensuring that student progression and assessment within practice placement elements of the programme was equitable. Discussions with practice placement educators revealed that any concerns at placements would first be raised with the student and then, if appropriate, with the practice placement coordinator. Where necessary, there would be a three-way discussion involving the practice placement educator, student and practice placement coordinator that would attempt to solve the problem and to identify any remedial action required. The programme team confirmed that they worked closely with practice placement educators where concerns about a student were identified and agreed remedial actions to be taken. Discussions raised at least one case where a student had failed a placement, but the programme team had worked closely with the practice placement educator concerned. The visitors noted the measures that were taken in the event of concerns being raised about the ability of a student to complete a placement and require these to be detailed in the programme documentation so that the procedure is clear to all parties involved. The visitors also require further evidence of how parity of assessment between placements is ensured by the education provider, including how the learning outcomes required are clearly indicated to all parties, and how regulations around student progression are clear with regard to placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to articulate clearly the requirements for student progression, the processes in place to ensure parity of assessment and procedures for failing a student throughout the programme.

Reason: As already noted in the condition against SET 6.6, the visitors were unclear about the procedure by which the education provider would deal with student problems or determine failure at practice placements. The visitors require further evidence of the regulations and processes in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns, the criteria for failure, progression and for ensuring that assessment criteria are applied consistently to students work.

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

Condition: The programme documentation must be revised to state that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility to apply to the HPC Register.

Reason: The assessment regulations for the programme were included in the assessment handbook. These regulations included a statement that aegrotat and posthumous awards may be conferred in accordance with the education provider's Manual of General Regulations and Policies. The visitors noted that the assessment regulations did not explicitly state that an aegrotat award did not confer eligibility to apply to the HPC register. The visitors therefore require the education provider to amend the assessment regulations for the programme so that they state clearly that an aegrotat award does not confer eligibility to apply to the HPC Register 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 programme documentation must be revised to include a clear statement that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: The assessment regulations for the programme are included in the assessment handbook. These included reference to the involvement of external examiners, but did not indicate the knowledge, skills or expertise required of those undertaking this role. The programme handbook stated that the at least one of the external examiners 'will be an appropriately experienced and qualified counselling psychologist with active HPC Register 'practitioner psychologist' status'. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner but were concerned that the requirements relating to external examiners were not set out in the assessment regulations and did not stipulate the requirement to be registered with the HPC as a counselling psychologist. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the assessment regulations for the programme to include a clear statement that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register (counselling psychologist), unless other arrangements are agreed, to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendation

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 providing practice placement educators with access to the teaching and learning resources available for the programme.

Reason: The visitors were content that this standard was met. Discussions with practice placement educators indicated that they would welcome access to the education provider's library and other teaching and learning resources. The visitors suggested that the education provider should consider how access to teaching and learning resources could be made available to practice placement educators, for example through a dedicated web site. The visitors suggested that such a mechanism would also help in keeping practice placement educators informed about and up to date in relation to the programme's requirements.

Allan Winthrop
Nicola Bowes

Visitors' report

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Name of education provider | University of East London |
| Programme name | Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy) |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Practitioner psychologist |
| Relevant modality / domain | Clinical psychologist |
| Date of visit | 17 – 18 May 2012 |

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 5 July 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 23 August 2012. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 23 July 2012. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 23 August 2012.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Sandy Wolfson (Sport and exercise psychologist) |
| HPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ben Potter |
| HPC observer | Niall Lennon |
| Proposed student numbers | 31 |
| First approved intake | January 1995 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2012 |
| Chair | Jacqui Potter (University of East London) |
| Secretary | Michael Wozniak (University of East London) |
| Members of the joint panel | Chris McCusker (British Psychological Society) Sheila Youngson (British Psychological Society) Gary Latchford (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a 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.

Conditions

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

Condition: The programme team must clearly articulate, within the programme documentation the expected time after which they can reasonably expect feedback on assessments and pieces of work.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that the information regarding feedback is comprehensive. They also noted that the programme documentation did not specify any length of time in which a student could expect to receive feedback on a piece of work or the outcome of an assessment. However, in discussion with the students it was articulated that feedback was expected to be received by them after a period of 8 weeks but that this was not always the case and that feedback had been received by some students well after this period in some instances. In raising this issue with the programme team the visitors were made aware that the programme team has a target of 20 working days in which they aim to provide feedback to students. This meant that if the assessment or piece of work was undertaken prior to a holiday period or a period of extended leave then the feedback would not be returned within 8 weeks. The visitors therefore require the programme team to clearly articulate the policy around the provision of feedback to students in the programme documentation. In this way the programme team can ensure that students are aware of the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme, and that this standard continues to be met.

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 provide further evidence of where in the programme documentation it is clearly articulated that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not identify where it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to apply to the Register. The visitors were also unclear as to how this information is clearly communicated to students. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate where in the programme documentation it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to apply to the Register. In this way the visitors can be sure that this information is available to students and that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how best to support the work being done to capture the training experience of practice placement educators on the existing database of practice placements.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team it was made clear that they expected all practice placement educators to undertake the appropriate practice placement educator training which is provided. The visitors also noted that the programme team makes a note of those practice placement educators who have attended the initial training as well as the refresher training for more experienced educators. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard continues to be met. However, in further discussion with the programme team it was articulated that the information regarding a practice placement educators' training was captured in a system outside the main 'ACE' database. This had the implications of increasing the workload for the members of the programme team who were organising and arranging practice placements. In response to this the programme team have identified what needs to be done in order to include the practice placement educators' training data but that this has not yet been able to be undertaken. The visitors recommend that the education provider considers how best to support this continuing work in developing the 'ACE' database. In this way it may benefit from a reduction in staff time allocated to the arrangement of practice placements and an increase in time for staff to support the programme.

Sandy Wolfson
Ruth Baker

Visitors' report

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Name of education provider | University of Manchester |
| Programme name | Pg Dip Audiology (with clinical competency certificate - CCC) |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of HPC Register | Hearing aid dispensers |
| Date of visit | 21 – 22 March 2012 |

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 '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 17 May 2012 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 5 July 2012. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 29 June 2012. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 23 August 2012.

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 and validating body did not validate or review the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Audiology, full time, BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology), full time and MSc Audiology (with clinical competency certificate – CCC), full time. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

Visit details

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of HPC visitors and profession | Bernadette Waters (Occupational therapist) Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser) Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) |
| HPC executive officer (in attendance) | Lewis Roberts |
| Proposed student numbers | 11 students enrol on MSc Audiology (with clinical competency certificate – CCC) but can choose to exit with Postgraduate Diploma in Audiology (with clinical competency certificate – CCC) |
| First approved intake | June 2007 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2012 |
| Chair | Anne Hesketh (University of Manchester) |
| Secretary | Ryan Hurst (University of Manchester) |

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all of the programme documentation, and any advertising material, to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate and reflective of HPC regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted that elements of the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular, there were instances of incorrect or out-of-date terminology in reference to HPC 'accrediting' the programme. The HPC does not accredit education programmes we approve education programmes. The visitors also noted reference to 'state registration' throughout the documentation. The term 'state registered' is no longer used by the professions we regulate and should not be incorporated into any materials relating to an HPC approved programme. The documentation also, on occasion, stated that completion of the programme will enable graduates to register with the HPC. Upon successful completion of the programme all students become eligible to apply for registration with the HPC and as such the language the education provider uses needs to reflect this.

The visitors finally noted reference within the 'MSc Audiology Handbook' (page 8) to the Certificate of Audiological Competence (CAC), administered by the British Academy of Audiology. The visitors noted that this award is no longer available. 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.

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 clearly highlight that successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration as a hearing aid dispenser with the HPC. The education provider must also revisit the programme documentation to ensure that applicants and students are given further information about the option of becoming a hearing aid dispenser and what it entails. The education provider must finally clearly highlight the role of the HPC as the statutory regulator for hearing aid dispensers.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted limited reference to hearing aid dispensers and the fact that successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration as a hearing aid dispenser with the HPC. The visitors were concerned that the role of a hearing aid dispenser was not clearly highlighted within the programme

documentation and that potential applicants as well as students on the programme would be unaware of the options available to them. The visitors also noted little reference to the role of the HPC as the statutory regulator for hearing aid dispensers. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation in relation to information regarding the option of becoming a hearing aid dispenser to ensure that applicants have the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants are made aware of the funding arrangements for the programme and any likely additional costs associated with taking up a place on the programme.

Reason: In discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that all pre-Registration hearing aid dispenser programmes delivered by the education provider will now be funded by fee paying students. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to locate information relating to the funding of the programme. From discussions with students the visitors also noted that students may be expected to self-fund additional costs associated with taking up a place on the programme. Some students noted that they were required to stay in hospital accommodation when going on placement and that they self-funded the associated costs. Some students also stated that costs associated with accommodation and travel could be claimed back. The visitors were unable to locate information relating to additional costs or funding support within the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to ensure that the funding arrangements for the programme and any potential additional costs and funding support associated with the programme are clearly stated to demonstrate that this standard has been met.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that a system is in place for gaining students informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussion with the programme team, consent was obtained verbally from students when participating as service users in practical teaching. The visitors also noted that the education provider has plans to develop formal protocols to support the consent process. However, the visitors were not presented with formal protocols to demonstrate that a system is in place for gaining students informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching. The visitors therefore require the education provider to implement formal protocols for obtaining consent from students (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme) and for

managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching (such as alternative learning arrangements).

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 provide evidence of the mechanisms in place that ensure students who have been awarded a Postgraduate Diploma in Audiology by other education providers and then undertake the certificate in clinical competency (CCC) awarded by University of Manchester, meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted the approved programme that leads to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register is the Postgraduate Diploma in Audiology in combination with the clinical competency certificate (CCC), both awarded by University of Manchester. The visitors were satisfied the learning outcomes ensure those who successfully complete the Postgraduate Diploma in Audiology in combination with the clinical competency certificate (CCC) from the University of Manchester, meet the standards of proficiency for the hearing aid dispenser part of the Register. A significant number of the standards of proficiency are mapped against the Postgraduate Diploma in Audiology programme and the rest are mapped on the clinical competency certificate (CCC). Through discussion with the programme team it was stated the education provider accepts students on to the clinical competency certificate (CCC) who have been awarded a Postgraduate Diploma in Audiology from other education providers. The visitors noted that although a small number of UK education providers offer the Postgraduate Diploma in Audiology programme, not all are HPC approved. It is the combination of the learning outcomes associated with both the Postgraduate Diploma in Audiology and the clinical competency certificate (CCC) that ensure anybody who successfully completes both awards will meet the standards of proficiency. With this evidence the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures students admitted to the programme with an Postgraduate Diploma in Audiology by other education providers would be able to fully meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the register.

The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate the education provider has mechanisms in place that ensure students who have been awarded an Postgraduate Diploma in Audiology by other education providers and then undertake the certificate in clinical competency (CCC) awarded by University of Manchester, meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider using the accreditation of prior learning mechanisms for applicants who have been awarded an Postgraduate Diploma in Audiology by other education providers and then undertake the certificate in clinical competency (CCC) awarded by University of Manchester.

Reason: The visitors noted the approved programme that leads to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register is the Postgraduate Diploma in Audiology in combination with the clinical competency certificate (CCC), both awarded by University of Manchester. The visitors were satisfied the learning outcomes ensure those who successfully complete the University of Manchester Postgraduate Diploma in Audiology in combination with the clinical competency certificate (CCC), meet the standards of proficiency for the hearing aid dispenser part of the Register.

Through discussion with the programme team it was stated the education provider accepts students on to the clinical competency certificate (CCC) who have been awarded an Postgraduate Diploma in Audiology from other education providers. The visitors recommend the education provider should consider using the accreditation of prior learning mechanisms that are in place for applicants who have been awarded an Postgraduate Diploma in Audiology by other education providers. Using accreditation of prior learning mechanisms will ensure that all prior learning is mapped against the learning outcomes for the programme and all relevant standards of proficiency are covered.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to further highlight learning outcomes specific to the hearing aid dispenser part of the Register.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the delivery of hearing aid specific content ensures that those who successfully complete the programme can meet the relevant standards of proficiency. The visitors noted that the 'Professional Skills and Aural Rehabilitation' module incorporate professional issues and topics associated with hearing aid dispensing. The visitors also noted that students receive lectures from hearing aid dispensers and that some students get the opportunity to undertake practice placements in non-NHS settings. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors highlighted that it was not always clear which learning outcomes are associated with which standard of proficiency. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider revisiting the programme

documentation to further emphasise the learning outcomes that are specific to hearing aid dispensing.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider further developing opportunities for interprofessional learning within the programme.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors noted examples of interprofessional learning within the programme with sessions being shared with speech and language therapy students. The visitors were satisfied that the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group was adequately addressed and therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors also noted that the education provider runs a range of health and social care programmes and recommend that the education provider should continue to develop further opportunities for interprofessional learning within 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 reviewing its practice placement audit processes to ensure they are applicable to and include non-NHS placements.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied with the current system for approving and monitoring practice placements. The visitors noted that the education provider has a robust audit process in place for NHS placements. Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted future plans to expand the range of practice placements to include non-NHS placements. The visitors also noted the current arrangements in place where students can go to non-NHS settings for a period of ad hoc placement days to gain a greater insight into hearing aid dispensing and private practice. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider reviewing its practice placement audit processes to ensure they are applicable to and include non-NHS placements. The visitors suggest that this may be an adapted approval and monitoring mechanism for short ad hoc placements but highlight the importance of having some quality safeguards in place at all times.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the mechanisms in place to monitor the attendance of practice placement educators at practice placement educator training and introduce a requirement for refresher training.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with practice placement educators the visitors noted that the education provider

facilitates an annual 'Clinical Educator Training Day'. The visitors noted that all new practice placement educators must attend this training before they can supervise a student and that they are expected to attend subsequent practice placement educator training events. However, the visitors noted that refresher training is not mandatory and the education provider does not outline a minimum requirement for attendance at subsequent practice placement educator training events. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider should consider reviewing the mechanisms in place to monitor the attendance of practice placement educators at practice placement educator training and introduce a requirement for refresher training to ensure that all practice placement educators remain engaged with the programme and up to date.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider developing a system for checking the HPC registration details of practice placement educators in non-NHS practice placements.

Reason: Through discussions with the programme team the visitors noted future plans to expand the range of practice placements to include non-NHS placements. The visitors also noted the current arrangements in place where students can go to non-NHS settings for a period of ad hoc placement days to gain a greater insight into hearing aid dispensing and private practise. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider developing a system for checking the HPC registration details of practice placement educators in non-NHS practice placements to ensure that this standard continues to be met if the programme increases its use of non-NHS placements.

Bernadette Waters
Richard Sykes
Hugh Crawford