

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)
<b>Programme name</b>	Doctorate in Educational Psychology (DEdPsy)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Educational psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	17 – 18 April 2012

## Contents

Contents .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendation .....	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 '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. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2012. At the Committee meeting on 12 June 2012, 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 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	Trevor Holme (Educational psychologist) Julie Harrower (Forensic psychologist)
HPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	10 per cohort once a year
First approved intake	September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	David Lloyd (Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd))
Secretary	N/A
Members of the joint panel	Frederika Bradbury (British Psychological Society) John Franey (British Psychological Society) Jeune Guishard-Pine (British Psychological Society) Jean Law (British Psychological Society) Rupal Nathwani (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"/>
Admissions and selection process information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme resources information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme Board and Committee minutes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other programme documentation collated for the visit	<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 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

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

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly state in the programme documentation that interim or exit awards are not in place for this programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors noted the SETs mapping document stated there were no exit or interim awards on the programme. The visitors considered it to be important for students and potential applicants to be aware of this to ensure there is no confusion. The visitors require the programme documentation to be revised to clearly include this information for students and potential applicants.

### **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 clearly state in the programme documentation that aegrotat awards will not be conferred on students from this programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation the visitors noted the SETs mapping document stated there was no aegrotat award for this programme. The visitors considered it to be important for students and potential applicants to be aware of this to ensure there is no confusion. The visitors require the programme documentation to be revised to clearly include this information for students and potential applicants.

## Recommendation

### **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 visitors suggest the programme team consider including specific information about the requirement for a good command of reading, writing and spoken English for applicants and potential applicants for the programme.

**Reason:** From documentation and discussion at the visit the visitors were satisfied with the admission procedures and the information provided for applicants and potential applicants. During the admissions procedures the programme team looked for evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English through interview procedures and the written applications. The visitors felt the procedures were communicated well although this particular aspect of the process was not clearly specified. The visitors recommend the programme team consider including information about the requirement for a good command of reading, writing and spoken English with an explanation of why this is important for a programme of this nature to aid the admissions process.

Trevor Holme  
Julie Harrower