![hpc health professions council logo]

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	The British Psychological Society
Programme name	Qualification in Counselling Psychology
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Counselling psychologist
Date of visit	3-4 March 2010

Contents

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 14 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist'or '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. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 16 September 2010. At the Committee meeting on 16 September 2010, the ongoing approval of the programme was re-confirmed. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Practitioner psychologist profession came onto the register in 1 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.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Liz Holey (Physiotherapist) David Packwood (Counselling psychologist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Brendon Edmonds
Proposed student numbers	100
Initial approval	1 January 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Martin Eubank (British Psychological Society)
Secretary	Jessica Close (British Psychological Society)
Members of the joint panel	Mark Forshaw (Observer, British Psychological Society) Kathryn Waddington (Observer, British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐
Assessment Regulations	☒	☐	☐

			4
Professional Practice Guidelines Programme Management sturcutres QCop Website pages Co-ordinator of Training and Supervisor training sessions Enrolment Assessors guidelines Internal validation documentation Equality and Diversity Strategy QAA Subject benchmark statement			

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☐	☒	☒
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☐	☒	☒

The HPC did not see the learning resources or specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the qualification does not require any specialist laboratories or teaching rooms.

Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.
.
The visitors agreed that 38 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 19 SETs.

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to more clearly articulate the statutory requirement for Counselling psychologists to be registered with the Health Professions Council.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the advertising guidance issued by HPC. In particular it should be made clear throughout all documentation that anyone who wishes to practice using the title Counselling psychologist must be on the HPC register.

The visitors' consider the absence of this information could be potentially misleading to candidates. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation and any advertising material (prospectus, website) to be updated to articulate this requirement.

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

Condition: The education provider must redraft the admissions documentation to clearly articulate the admissions criteria used to assess the entry of potential candidates to the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted the programme documentation articulated the process for admitting potential candidates to the programme. They also noted at the visit the programme team advised they appointed enrolment assessors who were trained to assess applications to the programme. The visitors were not provided with the criteria the assessors use to make judgements about each candidate's qualifications, experience and appropriateness to be admitted to the programme.

The visitors' consider the absence of clear objective criteria does not give 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. The visitors require the programme team to develop objective criteria and a process which requires candidates to clearly map their qualifications and experience against the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs). Criteria must be developed which provides the assessors with a framework with which judgements can be made about a candidate's qualifications and experience. The criteria must be used to determine which SOPs have been meet at admission and which SOPs are still to be met through the candidate's progression on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the process for applicants to provide evidence of a criminal conviction check at an enhanced level.

Reason: The visitors noted in the additional documentation submitted prior to the visit the programme team proposed amend the 'Regulations for Society's Postgraduate Qualifications' and 'Candidate Handbook for the Qualification in Counselling Psychology' to articulate the requirement for evidence of an enhanced CRB check at admission. The amendments did not articulate the process to be used to manage any issues arising from this enhanced CRB check.

In order to further evidence how this SET is met, the visitors require the programme documentation to be redrafted to articulate the proposed amendments and to also include a process for managing CRB issues which may arise at the admissions stage and also whilst a candidate is progressing through the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the process for conducting health checks as part of the admissions process.

Reason: The visitors noted in the additional documentation submitted prior to the visit the programme team proposed amend the 'Enrolment Form' to include a process for conducting health checks. The amendments did not articulate the process to be used to manage any issues health related issues at admissions or whilst the candidate was progressing through the programme.

In order to evidence how this SET is met, the visitors require the programme documentation be revisited to articulate the proposed amendments and to also include a process for managing health issues which may arise at the admissions stage and also whilst a candidate is completing the programme. The process must specifically address how applicants with disabilities are assessed and if any disabilities may prevent an applicant from meeting the SOPS during admission to the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must document the criteria used to assess an applicant's prior learning and experience upon admission to the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and at the visit enrolment assessors were appointed to admit candidates to the programme. The

visitors were not provided with the criteria the enrolment assessors use to make judgements about each candidate's qualifications, experience and appropriateness to be admitted to the programme. In particular the visitors' were not clear as to how applicants eligible for AP(E)L are assessed in relation to the learning outcomes for the programme. The visitors are therefore not satisfied there is a system in place which ensures a candidate is able to demonstrate meeting all the Standards of Proficiency upon successful completion of the programme.

The visitors require the education provider to develop criteria and a process which requires candidates to clearly map their qualifications and experience against the learning outcomes for the programme. Criteria must be developed which provides the assessors with a framework with which judgements can be made about a candidate's qualifications and experience in relation to the learning outcomes. The criteria must be used to determine which learning outcomes have been met at admission and which are still to be met through the candidate's progression on the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the systems in place to effectively manage the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation articulated the programme structure and the various roles which are fulfilled to deliver the programme. At the visit itself, the visitors' met with the programme team, Co-ordinators of Training and Practice Supervisors to further discuss the management of the programme. Although the visitors were satisfied there were adequate numbers of staff and professionals in place to deliver the programme, they were not satisfied that the systems in place adequately supported all aspects of the delivery of the programme.

In particular, the visitors noted there was no system in place to formally and regularly assess the performance of individuals performing in the various roles within the management of the programme. These roles include the Programme Leader, Registrar, Co-ordinators of Training and Placement Supervisors. The visitors also noted there was no system in place for the Registrar and/or Programme leader to maintain regular contact with candidates once they commenced on the programme. Updates on progression were obtained as part of a yearly submission to the education provider and contained reports from the candidate, the practice supervisor and the Coordinator of Training. The visitors also noted the programme had limited formal evaluation of the programme. Feedback was sought through online surveys from students, placement providers and Coordinators of Training. Opportunities for feedback were also made available at training sessions and conferences. Informal feedback could also be submitted at anytime to the programme team by email and phone. The visitors were not satisfied these systems provided adequate opportunities for formal evaluation and feedback.

The visitors therefore require these areas of the management of the programme to be addressed. Further information of these areas are articulated in conditions for SET 3.3, 3.7, 3.12 and 5.4 detailed further on in this report.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the regular monitoring and evaluations systems in place for the programme.

Reason: The visitors evidenced the current systems in place to monitor and evaluate the programme from the documentation provided and also from meetings with various groups at the visit. In particular, the visitors noted candidate, practice supervisor and Coordinator of Training feedback was sought through the completion of online feedback. Furthermore feedback was also sought from Coordinators of Training and Assessors as part of bi-annual and annual training sessions. An External Examiner was also appointed to provide independent assessment of the programme.

In light of these systems the visitors were not satisfied the systems in place provided sufficient evidence of regular monitoring and evaluation of the programme. Furthermore the visitors were not satisfied the systems in place include mechanisms to act on any information gathered. The visitors noted the current systems in place are dependent on candidates, COTs, practice supervisors and assessors engaging with processes. Although useful, the visitors require the education provider to develop regular systems to engage these groups more frequently than on an annual or bi-annual basis. Furthermore, the visitors require further evidence of how information gathered from the current and future systems is consolidated into clear action plans with appropriate timeframes and resources allocated. Further evidence is also required of how any programme enhancements are then communicated to the all involved in completing and progressing on the programme.

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 systems in place to conduct staff appraisals.

Reason: The visitors noted the various roles fulfilled by staff and professionals to deliver the programme. These roles include that of Programme Leader, Registrar, Academic Quality, Coordinator of Training, Practice Supervisor, Enrolment Assessor and Assessor (Assessment). The visitors were also provided with criteria governing the responsibilities and duties to be performed in each role. However, the visitors were not provided with evidence of how individuals are assessed for their performance in these roles.

The visitors were not satisfied adequate systems were in place to assess the performance of individuals in the various roles and therefore were not satisfied this SET is met. The visitors' require further evidence of the systems in place to

conduct regular staff/professional appraisals across all the roles fulfilled on the programme. Any system must articulate how appraisals are conducted, the criteria used to make assessments, the frequency for conducting appraisals and how any issues arising from the appraisals are managed.

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 training provided to new professionals fulfilling roles on the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted the various roles fulfilled by staff and professionals to deliver the programme. These roles include that of Programme leader, Registrar, Academic Quality, Coordinator of Training, Practice Supervisor, Enrolment Assessor and Assessor (Assessment). The visitors were also provided with information regarding on-going training conducted with persons fulfilling these roles. However, the visitors were not provided with training materials used to induct and train newly appointed Enrolment Assessors, Assessors, COTs and Practice Supervisors. Also, no evidence was provided of how training was specifically delivered and the frequency at which this training was delivered throughout the year to these groups.

To be satisfied this SET is met, the visitors require further evidence of the training materials and schedule of training for newly appointed professionals to the roles listed above.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the system in place to provide academic and pastoral support to candidates.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and through meetings at the visit itself the academic and pastoral support of the candidate relied heavily on interactions with practice supervisors and the Coordinator of Training. Candidates were only required to meet with their COT twice per year (minimum) and these meetings were at a cost to the candidate. Furthermore, the visitors also noted staff on the programme did not initiate any contact with candidates and relied on yearly reports to monitor progress.

The visitors require further evidence of how the programme team directly support candidates to be satisfied this SET is met. In particular, any evidence should address how the programme team intend to maintain regular contact with candidates as they progress on the programme. Evidence of the nature and frequency of this contact, how records of contact are maintained and how issues from this contact feed into the annual assessment of a candidates' progress should also be articulated.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the complaints process to ensure it can be applied for candidates on placement.

Reason: The visitors noted in the additional documentation submitted prior to the visit, the programme team proposed to amend the complaints procedure to encompass placements settings. Furthermore, the programme team provided a document at the visit itself proposing changes to the Co-ordinator of Training and Supervisor Handbook to include such amendments.

To be satisfied this SET is met, the visitors require further evidence of these amendments being made to the programme documentation where appropriate. Any further evidence will need to ensure these amendments are sufficiently communicated to all parties involved in the placement experience including candidates, Coordinators of Training and Practice Supervisors.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures the provision of a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the plan of training submitted at the beginning of the programme and subsequently on a yearly basis for update. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the candidate, the placement supervisor and the placement host in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience. The Coordinator of Training is also responsible for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience of the candidate including providing a safe and supportive environment. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures each placement site provide a safe and supportive environment. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit is used to conduct a risk assessment of each placement site, a placement induction and how candidates are made aware about risks and safety issues. An audit tool should also address how a record of these activities is maintained and sent back to the education provider.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the plan of training submitted at the beginning of the programme and subsequently on a yearly basis for update. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the candidate, the placement supervisor and the placement host in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience. The CoT is also responsible for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience of the candidate. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them.

The visitors require further evidence of the system used to approve each placement site and how that tool ensures ongoing monitoring is conducted. In particular any evidence should address how an audit tool is linked to any policies and processes for approving placements, how the audit tool is used to approved the placement site, how the audit tool is used to continually monitor the quality of the placement, how this information is recorded and how any issues arising are managed and inform the development of processes. An audit tool should also address how a record of these activities is maintained and sent back to the education provider.

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 further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures placement sites have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to candidates.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the plan of training submitted at the beginning of the programme and subsequently on a yearly basis for update. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the candidate, the placement supervisor and the placement host in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience. The CoT is also responsible for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience of the candidate and that appropriate equality and diversity policies are in place. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures each placement site has an equality and diversity policy in place for candidates. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit is used to evidence the presence of such policies together with an indication of how these policies are implemented and monitored at the placement site. The audit tool should also address how a record of these policies is provided to the education provider.

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 further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures placement sites have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the plan of training submitted at the beginning of the programme and subsequently on a yearly basis for update. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the candidate, the placement supervisor and the placement host in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience. The CoT is also responsible for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience. Furthermore the practice supervisor may not always be employed within the placement environment which the candidate is placed in. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures each placement site has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experience staff. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit is used to assess the provision of staff in accordance with the learning needs of the individual candidate. The audit tool should also address how a record of these assessments is maintained and provided to the education provider.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the plan of training submitted at the beginning of the programme and subsequently on a yearly basis. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the candidate, the placement supervisor and the placement host in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience. The CoT is also responsible for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience. Furthermore the practice supervisor may not always be employed within the placement environment which the candidate is placed in. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit is used to assess the

whether placement educators are appropriate to meeting the learning needs of the individual candidate and that they provide a safe environment.   The audit tool should also address how a record of these assessments is maintained and provided to the education provider.

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

Condition: The education provider must require practice supervisors to undertake mandatory refresher training sessions.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through meetings at the visit the education provider conducted refresher training sessions for practice supervisors. However these training sessions were not mandatory and therefore not all practice supervisors undertook the refresher training on a regular basis.

In order to be satisfied the SET is met, the visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence articulating the requirement for practice supervisor training to be mandatory. In particular, any evidence submitted should detail how this training is to be conducted, the frequency with which it will be mandatory for practice supervisors to attend and also the implications for supervisors who do not undergo refresher training.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the audit tool used to approve and monitor placement environments which ensures placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: The visitors noted through the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, the use of a placement agreement. This placement agreement is completed as part of the plan of training submitted at the beginning of the programme and subsequently on a yearly basis for update. The agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities for the candidate, the placement supervisor and the placement host in agreeing to be involved in the placement learning experience. The CoT is also responsible for ensuring the placement is appropriate to facilitate the learning experience. Furthermore the practice supervisor may not always be employed within the placement environment which the candidate is placed in. The visitors were not provided with any audit tool used by the education provider to approve each placement site and any systems in place to effectively monitor them.

The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures all placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. In particular, any evidence should address how an audit tool is used to assess the whether placement educators are registered and if not, how they are deemed to be appropriate to provide placement education to the candidate. The

audit tool should also address how a record of these assessments is maintained and provided to the education provider.

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 systems in place to ensure regular collaboration between the education provider and the placement provider.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and through the various meetings at the visit, collaboration between the placement sites and the education provider relied heavily upon the role of the CoT and the placement supervisor. At times the placement supervisor may not be placed within the placement site where the candidate is placed. Any communication conducted within these structures was not recorded formally. However, an annual update of training is submitted to the education provider which involves input from the candidate, the CoT and the practice supervisor.

In light of this information, the visitors are not satisfied a system is in place to provide regular, recorded collaboration between the education provider and practice placement environments. Any further evidence should detail how staff on the programme maintain regular contact with placement providers. In particular, the system should detail how contact provides a channel for regular communication directly between the placement site and the education provider to allow for feedback on the candidate's progression or on the programme planning and design. The system should also address how a record of this communication is maintained by education provider and how any issues highlighted from the system are actioned.

6.2 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the assessment criteria to ensure they reflect QAA D-level descriptors.

Reason: The visitors noted the assessment criteria used for the various pieces of assessment on the programme. The visitors deemed the assessment criteria did not reflect the QAA criteria stated for the level of the qualification as articulated in the Candidate Handbook on pg. 5. Furthermore, the candidates indicated in their feedback to the panel they were often unclear of the expected level to be demonstrated when completing pieces of assessment.

The visitors consider the differences between the assessment criteria and the QAA criteria to be potentially confusing for candidates. The visitors require the assessment criteria be revised to more clearly articulate how these relate to the QAA D-level descriptors set for the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the learning outcomes to ensure they reflect the D-level assessment criteria.

Reason: The visitors noted the learning outcomes set for the eight dimensions of the programme. The visitors deemed the learning outcomes did not reflect the QAA D-level descriptors stated for the level of the qualification as articulated in the Candidate Handbook on pg. 5. Furthermore, the candidates indicated in their feedback to the panel they were often unclear of the level expected to be demonstrated when completing pieces of assessment.

The visitors consider the differences between the learning outcomes and the QAA D-level descriptors to be potentially confusing for candidates and assessors. The visitors require the learning outcomes be revised to more clearly articulate how these relate to the QAA D-level descriptors set for the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must develop assessment criteria for all pieces of assessment on the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation the assessment criteria listed for each piece of assessment. The visitors deemed the assessment criteria did not sufficiently provide the opportunity for a candidate and assessor to make an objective assessment of work submitted. Furthermore, the visitors deemed the assessment criteria did not sufficiently assess whether a student was fit to practise. In discussions with candidates, the programme team, and the practice placement representatives, it was noted the assessment criteria did not clearly articulate the level at which a candidates work may pass or fail.

The visitors consider the lack of clear, objective assessment criteria to be potentially confusing for candidates and assessors. The visitors require the programme team revisit the programme documentation to develop assessment criteria which clearly articulates an objective assessment of student performance. The assessment criteria must be specific to each piece of assessment for the programme including criteria for the assessment of competencies through the completion of the competency logbook.

Recommendations

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider the appointment of a full time member of staff to further support the management of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted the Registrar was appointed to the programme on a part time basis. Furthermore, they also noted the programme leader was in a voluntary position providing overall management of the programme. The visitors also noted the programme relied heavily on the involvement of professional volunteers to ensure the programme was delivered effectively.

The visitors were satisfied there were sufficient staff in place to deliver the programme. However, the visitors recommend the education provider consider appointing a member of staff on a full time basis to further assist the management of the programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider making reference to the HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics in any process or guidelines related to students' profession-related conduct.

Reason: The visitors noted the presence of a process to deal with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. Furthermore the visitors noted the process and guidance made reference to the Society's Code of Ethics and Conduct and the DCoP Professional Practice Guidelines.

Although the visitors deem this SET to be met, they recommend the education provider revise the programme documentation to refer to the HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics in any process or guidelines related to dealing with students' profession-related conduct.

4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider developing and delivering more workshops related to assessments on the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from meeting with candidates and the programme team workshops were delivered at key points each year to assist candidates with pieces of assessment. The candidates indicated these workshops were useful in completing and submitting assessment.

The visitors are satisfied this SET is met, however recommend the education provider consider developing the delivery of these workshops to further expand the range of teaching and learning approaches used on the programme. In

particular, the education provider should consider alternative methods for workshop delivery to ensure all candidates can access these.

David Packwood
Liz Holey