Approval process report

University of Dundee, practitioner psychology, 2024-2025

## Executive Summary

This is a report of the process to approve the Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology (DAppEdPsy) programme at the University of Dundee. This report captures the process we have undertaken to assess the institution and programme(s) against our standards, to ensure those who complete the proposed programme(s) are fit to practice.

We have:
- Reviewed the institution against our institution level standards and found our standards are met in this area
- Reviewed the programme against our programme level standards and found our standards are met in this area
- Recommended all standards are met, and that the programme should be approved
- Decided that all standards are met, and that the programme is approved

Through this assessment, we have noted:
- The following are areas of best practice:
    - Oversight of guest lecturers and broad interdisciplinary input enriches the learning experience and maintains academic standards
    - Use of disability plans and early support mechanisms demonstrate commitment to accessibility
    - The 3-strand model promotes the integration of theory and practice
    - Strong links between University and placement services, and clear supervision structure.
    - The use of multiple assessments in recruitment ensures robust selection of applicants
    - Professional behaviour is integrated throughout both academic and placement learning
    - Integration of research, practice, and theory ensures alignment with current expectations.
    - Strong engagement with stakeholders ensures up-to-date content.
    - Embeds integration as a core design principle, not an add-on.
    - emphasis on reflexivity and critical engagement supports professional growth.
    - Embedded evidence-based principles from the start of training.
    - Professional conduct is assessed across modules and learning activities, not in isolation

- Use of a development tracker is a strong mechanism for holistic assessment and reflection over time

| | |
|---|---|
| Previous consideration | N / A as this case did not arise from a previous process |
| Decision | The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide:<br>• whether the programme is approved |
| Next steps | Outline next steps / future case work with the provider:<br>• Subject to the Panel's decision, we will add the programme to the list of approved programmes which eligibility for application to the Register.<br>• The education provider will next go through performance review in 2028-29. |

## Included within this report

# Section 1: About this assessment

## About us

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

This is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the programme detailed in this report meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the programme approval.

## Our standards

We approve education providers and programmes that meet our education standards. Individuals who complete approved programmes will meet proficiency standards, which set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

## Our regulatory approach

We are flexible, intelligent and data-led in our quality assurance of programme clusters and programmes. Through our processes, we:
- enable bespoke, proportionate and effective regulatory engagement with education providers;
- use data and intelligence to enable effective risk-based decision making; and
- engage at the organisation, profession and programme levels to enhance our ability to assess the impact of risks and issues on HCPC standards.

Providers and programmes are approved on an open-ended basis, subject to ongoing monitoring. Programmes we have approved are listed on our website.

## The approval process

Institutions and programmes must be approved by us before they can run. The approval process is formed of two stages:
- Stage 1 – we take assurance that institution level standards are met by the institution delivering the proposed programme(s)

- Stage 2 – we assess to be assured that programme level standards are met by each proposed programme

Through the approval process, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess whether providers and programmes meet standards based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. Our standards are split along institution and programme level lines, and we take assurance at the provider level wherever possible.

This report focuses on the assessment of the self-reflective portfolio and evidence.

**How we make our decisions**

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint partner visitors to design quality assurance assessments, and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make the decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee takes decisions through different levels depending on the routines and impact of the decision, and where appropriate meets in public. Their decisions are available to view on our website.

**The assessment panel for this review**

We appointed the following panel members to support this review:

| | |
|---|---|
| Garrett Kennedy | Lead visitor, Practitioner psychologist |
| Sasha Hall | Lead visitor, Practitioner psychologist |
| Niall Gooch | Education Quality Officer |

## Section 2: Institution-level assessment

**The education provider context**

The education provider currently delivers four HCPC-approved post-registration programmes for independent prescribing and supplementary prescribing annotations. It is a Higher Education Institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2007.

The education provider engaged with the performance review process in the model of quality assurance in 2023. At the meeting in September 2024 the Education and Training Committee agreed that there was sufficient evidence that the standards continued to be met, and the programmes remain approved.

**Practice areas delivered by the education provider**

The provider is approved to deliver training in the following professional areas. A detailed list of approved programme awards can be found in Appendix 2 of this report.

| | Practice area | Delivery level | Approved since |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Post-registration** | Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing | | 2007 |

**Institution performance data**

Data is embedded into how we understand performance and risk. We capture data points in relation to provider performance, from a range of sources. We compare provider data points to benchmarks, and use this information to inform our risk based decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of institutions and programmes.

This data is for existing provision at the institution, and does not include the proposed programme(s).

| Data Point | Bench-mark | Value | Date | Commentary |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Learner number capacity | 300 | 322 | 4 June 2025 | The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of learners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure is the benchmark figure, plus the number of learners the provider is |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | proposing through the new provision. |
| Learner non-continuation | 7% | 2% | 2021-22 | This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.<br><br>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.<br><br>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has dropped by 2%.<br><br>We did not explore this data point through this assessment because we considered that it did not suggest any issues or problems. |
| Outcomes for those who complete programmes | 92% | 96% | 2021-22 | This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.<br><br>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms<br><br>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | performance has been maintained.<br><br>We did not explore this data point through this assessment because we did not consider that the data point raised any concerns or issues. |
| Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award | N/A | N/A | 2023 | N / A because this is a Scottish institution and does not participate in TEF. |
| Learner satisfaction | 79.6% | 82.2% | 2024 | This data was sourced at the subject level. This means the data is for HCPC-related subjects.<br><br>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.<br><br>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has improved by 3%.<br><br>We did not explore this data point through this assessment because we did not consider that this data point raised any specific concerns. |
| HCPC performance review cycle length | Five years | | 2023-24 | The education provider went through performance review in the 2023-24 academic year and were given a five year review period, the maximum available through the process. |

**The route through stage 1**

Institutions which run HCPC-approved provision have previously demonstrated that they meet institution-level standards. When an existing institution proposes a new programme, we undertake an internal review of whether we need to undertake a full partner-led review against our institution level standards, or whether we can take assurance that the proposed programme(s) aligns with existing provision.

In this particular case, the existing provision at the education provider consists of prescribing programmes. When these programmes were approved, they will have to meet the standards for prescribing (SFPs), which largely overlap with the standards of education and training (SETs) but do have some differences.

This means that the education provider has not previously had to meet the stage 1 institution standards. Normally, this would require a visitor-led stage 1. This would involve them preparing a documentary submission to show that they meet all the institution-level SETs. However, we have determined in this case that it would be disproportionately burdensome to require the education provider to complete visitor-led stage 1.

This is because the HCPC SFPs that they have already met cover almost all the areas covered by the stage 1 SETs. Areas where some additional scrutiny from visitors might be required can be considered through stage 2. In the section below, we go through the areas covered by the institution-level SETs.

As part of the request to approve the proposed programme(s), the education provider supplied information to show alignment in the following areas.

<u>Admissions</u>

**Findings on alignment with existing provision:**

- **Information for applicants** –
  - The education provider stated in their approval request form that they will adopt the current institutional admissions process. They noted that all relevant information will be available on their website.
  - The education provider's materials for applicants explain the nature of each programme in detail and set out expectations for learners. There are individual webpages which set out the details and expectations of each programme they offer.
  - The education provider completed performance review during the 2023-24 academic year. They provided detailed reflection on their admissions processes and the visitors considered that their performance was good.
  - In light of the above, we can be confident that the education provider is able to provide complete and accurate information for applicants. This aims to enable prospective learners' clear understanding of the programme and their role within it.

- The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Assessing English language, character, and health** –
  - The education provider noted their university admissions process, which sets out in detail how applicants' abilities in these areas are assessed and considered. The application form requires learners to affirm that they have adequate facility in the English language to complete the programme. Applicants must also confirm that they have no criminal convictions or health issues which would prevent them from doing so. The university-level policy requires all programmes to ensure that they only admit learners who meet relevant professional, statutory and regulatory body (PSRB) requirements.
  - In light of the above policies and procedures, we consider that the relevant standards are met. This is because the education provider has clear mechanisms for ensuring that learners have appropriate language skills, good character and meet health requirements.
  - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Prior learning and experience (AP(E)L)** –
  - The education provider state through the approval request form that they will not apply AP(E)L on the proposed new programme. There is a university-level policy for AP(E)L but will not be applicable for this programme.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI)**–
  - The education provider state that they have an institutional approach to EDI, which are set out in their policies. There are pathways which learners can use if they have concerns about their treatment in the admissions process, and policies and procedures are subject to equality impact assessments (EIAs). The admissions process makes allowances for applicants to demonstrate aptitude for programmes in ways other than conventional qualifications.
  - Based on this evidence, we can be confident that the relevant standard is met. The education provider has a flexible and well-defined process for ensuring that their programme is as open as possible to a wide range of qualified individuals. The education provider completed performance review in 2023-24 and their performance was considered satisfactory.
  - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.

**Non-alignment requiring further assessment:** None.

<u>Management and governance</u>

**Findings on alignment with existing provision:**

- **Ability to deliver provision to expected threshold level of entry to the Register[1]** –
    - The education provider stated that they have governance processes to ensure that programmes are effectively delivered. These processes are based on policies which set out in detail the expectations and requirements for all programmes.
    - We consider that the relevant standards are met because the education provider has clearly demonstrated the institutional capacity to deliver HCPC-approved programmes at the appropriate threshold.
    - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Sustainability of provision** –
    - The education provider noted that all programmes are required by university-level policies to comply with relevant PSRB requirements about the sustainability of programmes. For example, all programmes must align with the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA). QAA benchmarking must be used by all programmes to appropriately calibrate the curriculum and learning outcomes.
    - The programme has been extensively scrutinised through internal approval processes, culminating in internal approval in 2024. The strategic direction and justification for the programme has been agreed by senior leadership, including a detailed operational plan and estimates for equipment requirements. Annual monitoring of recruitment levels and learner progression takes place at the divisional level, and any issues are discussed with the programme leaders by senior people in their division.
    - We consider that the relevant standard is met, because the education provider has well-defined and effective processes in place for ensuring programme sustainability. Performance in this area was considered good during the 2023-24 performance review.
    - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Effective programme delivery** –
    - The education provider state that they have an institutional plan which requires all programmes to create a delivery scheme. All programme leads are required to consider this plan when planning the delivery and structure of new programme.
    - The education provider has a defined governance structure, with clear lines of responsibility for individual programme leads to report on their own programmes and deliver improvements as necessary. Programme management must report to senior leadership on a regular basis and there is driving improvements where necessary. This process involves annual review, overseen by senior leadership, which notes areas for improvement and revisits them in the following year's review.

[1] This is focused on ensuring providers are able to deliver qualifications at or equivalent to the level(s) in SET 1, as required for the profession(s) proposed

- Based on the evidence presented, we considered that the relevant standards are met, because the education provider has defined processes for ensuring that programmes are effective and sustainable. Our 2023-24 performance review found that performance in this area was good.
  - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Effective staff management and development** –
  - The education provider stated that individual managers are responsible for individual staff development plans, according to institutional policies that set out the requirements for line managers. Recruitment is governed and monitored by a specific policy at the institutional level, which sets out how posts are advertised and how new recruits should be selected. All staff have a line manager and where necessary a mentor.
  - The education provider also stated that under the policies noted above, maintenance of staff research interests and professional knowledge is also strongly encouraged. Internally the education provider offers a range of development and training workshops for staff, in order to maintain and develop their skills and knowledge.
  - We consider that the relevant standards in this area are met, because the education provider has demonstrated the capacity to recruit, manage and develop their staff effectively. Our 2023-24 performance review found good performance in this area.
  - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Partnerships, which are managed at the institution level** –
  - Under the "Policy and guidance on the approval of new taught provision", the education provider requires new programmes to demonstrate to senior leadership that they will have systeamtic collaboration with their practice partners. The policy requires that there arefrequent and structured discussions with these partners. The education provider uses formal agreements to define and manage its relationships with clinical placement partners.
  - In light of the above we consider that the relevant standards are met, because the education provider has demonstrated the ability to manage partnerships in the most appropriate way for effective practice-based learning and clinical skill development. The 2023-24 performance review found that performance was good in these areas.
  - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.

**Non-alignment requiring further assessment:** None.

<u>Quality, monitoring, and evaluation</u>

**Findings on alignment with existing provision:**

- **Academic quality** –

- According to the education provider policy on new programme development, module co-ordinators have responsibility for quality of specific modules and annual reports by external examiners are used to ensure outside scrutiny. All subject areas must undergo regular institutional review (ILR). This involves both internal and external panel members. The intention of ILR is for programmes to be thoroughly reviewed at a deeper and more systematic level than the normal annual review, leading to improvements and developments as required.
  - All programme approvals must be signed off by the university leadership team, who will be guided by the education provider's Quality Code.
  - We consider that the relevant standards are met, because the education provider has demonstrated that they have appropriate process to monitor academic quality on the new programme, and take steps to improve quality where necessary. Performance in this area was considered good in the 2023-24 performance review.
  - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Practice quality, including the establishment of safe and supporting practice learning environments** –
  - The education provider have an institution-level policy which sets out how individual programme staff must ensure that practice educators are appropriately trained and prepared to supervise learners safely and appropriately. This means the education provider will be responsible for the initial and ongoing training of practice educators. This means they can equip practice educators with the necessary skills for supervision of learners and identify gaps in knowledge or skills among practice educators.
  - We consider that the relevant standards are met, because the education provider have demonstrated the ability to monitor practice quality, through various pathways, and to use relationships with practice partners to maintain quality. Performance in this area was considered good in the 2023-24 performance review.
  - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Learner involvement** –
  - The approval request form notes that learners are actively involved in programme development and monitoring at all levels. There is learner representation on key committees at all level. This is an institutional requirement according to their Learning And Teaching Framework (LATF).
  - The LATF sets out that there must be liaison groups where learners can raise concerns or have input into governance and decision-making. Any significant programme changes or reviews must involve learners, and there must be opportunities for informal feedback from learners to programme staff.

    - We consider the standards are met in this area because learners will be fully involved in the programme and its governance. The 2023-24 performance review found that performance in this area was good.
    - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Service user and carer involvement –**
    - The approval request form notes that service users and carers are likely to be involved but the referenced policy does not give detail.
    - The existing HCPC-approved provision at the education provider is prescribing programmes. This means that although they are an established provider, they do not have an existing level of institutional experience and expertise with service user involvement. We will therefore need to use stage 2 to clarify the detail of their service user involvement.
    - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.

**Non-alignment requiring further assessment:** Through stage 2 we will assess in more detail the education provider's plans for service user involvement on the new programme.

<u>Learners</u>

**Findings on alignment with existing provision:**

- **Support** –
    - The education provider's commitments in this area are governed by their Quality Framework. This statement lays out how they will work to maintain and improve the quality of the learner experience. It incorporates multiple procedures governing different components of learner experience, including specific policies on appeals, admissions, fitness to practice, academic integrity, reasonable adjustments, and discipline.
    - The objectives set out through this Quality Framework is for learner support to be integrated into the new programme. This isthrough the use of personal tutors and module leaders, and the programme handbook directory of services. Learners whose work is affected by personal circumstances can apply to have those taken into account. Career and development advisers will also be available. All this is set out in the "Guidance notes on mitigating circumstances and recurring circumstances and the process for their consideration".
    - We are confident that the relevant standards are met, because the education provider has demonstrated their ability support learners on the programme. The 2023-24 performance review considered that performance in this area was good.
    - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Ongoing suitability** –

- Learners will be required to abide by a university policy, which sets out the education provider's expectations and requirements of good behaviour and engagement with the programme. This is known as the "Taught Programmes: Student attendance and engagement policy".
  - According to this policy, learners' interpersonal and professional skills will be monitored and assessed through their practice-based learning. Prior to entering clinical placement learners are be required to sign the fitness to practice policy and code of conduct.
  - We consider that standards are met in this area the education provider has clear policies for monitoring ongoing suitability of learners. Our 2023-24 performance review found good performance in this area.
  - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Learning with and from other learners and professionals (IPL/E)** –
  - The education provider state that this area is governed by institutional policy. It is covered in the "Policy and guidance on the approval of new taught provision". Programmes are required to consider which learners and professionals should be included in IPL/E. However, there is little detail about how the policy will enable and encourage programmes to have the kind of IPL/E required by the HCPC standards. This means that we will need to consider this area in more detail through stage 2. Stage 2 is an appropriate place to consider this because it is a question about the specific arrangements for the proposed new programme.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion** –
  - Through the approval request form, the education provider describe the support available to learners in their safeguarding policy, and in their policy on supporting student unions. All modules have an attached statement explaining how it aligns with the education provider's Equality, Diversity and Human Rights policy.They note too in their "Reasonable accommodations policy" that they aim to be flexible and to make reasonable accommodations where possible. We consider that the relevant standards are met, because the education provider has clearly considered how best to create a supportive and welcoming environment for all learners. We considered that performance in this area was good through the 2023-24 performance review.
  - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.

**Non-alignment requiring further assessment:** Through stage 2 of this process we will consider the details of the programme's use of interprofessional education, and we will review how the education provider ensures appropriate approaches to equality, diversity and inclusion.

<u>Assessment</u>

**Findings on alignment with existing provision:**

- **Objectivity** –
  - The approval request form refers to the assessment handbook, which lays out the overall framework which programmes are required to follow in designing their assessments. They must explain and justify their design choices to senior leadership and abide by the assessment policy requirements on fairness.
  - As set out in the external examiner policy, the external examiner is required to approve major changes to programmes. Learners are provided with detailed information about assessment requirements and rationale, and module moderators will review assessment approaches on a regular basis.
  - We consider that the relevant standards are met, because the education provider will be able to ensure objectivity in assessment. We considered that performance in this area was good during the 2023-24 performance review.
  - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Progression and achievement** –
  - The approval request form sets out the academic policies and procedures governing progression and achievement of awards at the education provider.
  - Assessment and moderation is managed by boards held at the end of each term. The requirements for HCPC registration are set out in the programme specification.
  - We consider the standards met in this area because the education provider has a well-developed and defined approach to ensuring that learners can progress and achieve through the programme in a consistent way. Our 2023-24 performance review considered that the education provider was performing well in this area.
  - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Appeals** –
  - The education provider has an appeals policy governing this area. Learners who wish to appeal a decision of an academic body are be referred to this process in the first instance. Detailed information about the process will be easily available to learners on the education provider website and from student unions.
  - We consider standards met in this area because the education provider has clear mechanisms for allowing appeals and for communicating to learners the details of the processes. We found that performance was good in this area in the 2023-24 performance review.
  - The policies are institution-wide and will apply to the proposed programme.

**Non-alignment requiring further assessment:** None.

**Outcomes from stage 1**

We consider that the stage 1 standards are mostly met at threshold. However, we have highlighted several issues that we will need to consider in more detail through stage 2. Specifically, these are service user involvement, EDI, and interprofessional education, all highlighted above, because the education provider's demonstration of their ability to meet the standards for prescribing (SFPs) will have demonstrated their ability to meet the SETs in the other areas.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None.

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None.

## Section 3: Programme-level assessment

**Programmes considered through this assessment**

| Programme name | Mode of study | Profession (including modality) / entitlement | Proposed learner number, and frequency | Proposed start date |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology (DAppEdPsy) | FT (Full time) | Practitioner psychologist, Educational psychologist | 22 learners, 1 cohort | 01/09/2025 |

**Stage 2 assessment – provider submission**

The education provider was asked to demonstrate how they meet programme level standards for each programme. They supplied information about how each standard was met, including a rationale and links to supporting information via a mapping document.

**Quality themes identified for further exploration**

We reviewed the information provided, and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their submission. We did not consider the quality activity was required, due to the comprehensiveness and thorough submission, although we did seek to clarify certain matters.

## Section 4: Findings

This section details the visitors' findings from their review through stage 2, including any requirements set, and a summary of their overall findings.

**Overall findings on how standards are met**

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings against the programme-level standards. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **SET 1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register** –
  - The programme qualification is a doctorate, which is the expected level for the education psychologist profession.
- **SET 2: Programme admissions** –
  - The education provider submitted documents explaining their recruitment process. This included a recruitment folder, selection criteria, a candidate info pack, task descriptors, and scoring guides.
  - The visitors reviewed the education provider's recruitment strategy, which the education provider stated was modelled on existing good practice elsewhere in the country. To be offered an interview, applicants will have to meet specific academic and professional experience criteria. The visitors understood that during the selection process applicants will have to perform at a very high level in the interview, in a group task and in a written task.
  - We considered the relevant standard was met because the education provider had evidenced a clear process for assessing the academic and professional background of applicants. Visitors were satisfied because the education provider presented a thorough and well-structured recruitment process. Applicants are required to meet clear academic and professional criteria and demonstrate high performance in interviews, group tasks, and written assessments.
- **SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership** –
  - Regarding collaboration between the education provider and their practice-based learning partners, the visitors reviewed the education provider's narrative. This explained that they will have the following:
    - Yearly Practice Tutor network (PTN) meeting. The intent of the PTN, was to give "an opportunity for practice tutors to meet and discuss aspects relevant to trainee supervision and practice". The PTN will also co-ordinate training and development opportunities.
    - Twice annual tripartite practice assessment meetings for each trainee to discuss progress as well as an opportunity to raise any general or specific concerns with the education provider.
    - External selectors from the educational psychologist profession involved in the recruitment and selection process.

    - The programme directors are part of the National Scottish Steering Group for Educational Psychologists (NSSGEP). The visitors considered that this would enable direct links with the organisations who provide practice-based learning.
    - A reference group with representation from the profession, which will enable better collaboration.
- Regarding capacity, the visitors reviewed the education provider's involvement with NSSGEP, which they understood to be the key mechanism by which the education provider managed capacity. NSSGEP is governed by terms of reference and has quarterly meetings. NSSGEP has representatives from the Scottish government, other universities, the Association of Scottish Principal Educational Psychologists, the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities, and the Educational Institute of Scotland (EIS), a teaching union.
- The visitors understood from the mapping document that placements would be allocated via an allocation panel. The education provider stated that this panel would gather information about capacity from all relevant psychological services. The visitors understood that this information would be relevant for all years of the programme. Applicants who are offered a place on the programme must rank their preferences for Local Authority placement and are then allocated their annual placements from Years 1 to 3. The visitors were confident that the education provider could use this process effectively because it was integrated with other mechanisms for collaboration with partners available to the education provider.
- The education provider submitted the General Handbook which set out the staffing arrangements, including a workload plan and a teaching plan showing which staff would be delivering which parts of the programme. This supported the education provider's statement that they had 4.1 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) of registered practitioner psychologists available. They did note however that for the last four months of 2025 they would only have 3.3 FTE due to staff leave of absence. We asked the education provider how they intended to manage this and they explained that they had restructured the teaching arrangements. This was evidenced through amendments to the delivery and teaching plan, which the visitors reviewed and considered to be appropriate. The education provider's plan was to to use visiting lecturers to support programme delivery, and for some existing staff to assume additional teaching duties for the first term of the programme.
- The visitors reviewed key documents explaining how the programme would be resourced. These included the general handbook, the disability access policy, virtual classroom guidance, academic support guidance, peer support guidance and an attendance policy. The visitors understood from this documentation that learners would be able to make use of all the education provider's institutional mechanisms and arrangements. This included resources specifically

related to programme content and assessment but also resources for pastoral and academic support.
    - Having reviewed all the relevant information provided above, the visitors were confident that all the relevant standards are now met. This is because the education provider has demonstrated their ability to collaborate appropriately with practice partners, to resource the programme, and to provide sufficient qualified staff.
- **SET 4: Programme design and delivery** –
    - The education provider submitted a standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping exercise, which set out how the programme's learning outcomes have been aligned with the SOPs. The visitors reviewed module descriptors submitted by the education provider, and described how the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) would be taught through the modules. The British Psychological Society (BPS) Core Competencies were also cited as an important guidance point for the programme design. The education provider noted that they had a "Professionalism" theme running through the entire programme.
    - The visitors reviewed the general handbook and module descriptors, which were submitted as evidence that the programme will reflect the professional expectations appropriately. This was true in in terms of the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base of the programme. For maintaining links to current practice, the education provider noted that they consulted with other practitioner psychology programmes in Scotland and England, and used the most up-to-date British Psychological Society (BPS) guidance, from 2024. The visitors also understood from the evidence submitted that the education provider had a clear mechanism for ensuring clinical currency for the programme content. They would engage with other organisations – those mentioned in SET 3 – to ensure the programme was teaching content appropriate to the current understanding of the profession.
    - Regarding integration of theory and practice, and teaching and learning methods, the education provider submitted the programme modules and the general handbook, and a narrative stating which methods would be used and how theory and practice were integrated.
    - Regarding the ways in which the programme would support evidence-based practice and autonomous working, the education provider submitted a narrative explaining that "critical engagement" with practice and research was taught in the first module and enlarged on through the programme, with reference to different aspects of practice, including social justice and professional identity. They supported this with the relevant module descriptors and a link to the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (Level 12). The education provider noted that learners "will learn about the importance of evidence-based practice in all aspects of programme teaching. They explained how reading lists and teaching materials will be supported with evidence from the literature and best practice documentation based on the profession's self- evaluation methodology. Learners' understanding of

the use of evidence is expanded upon and developed through all modules.
    - The visitors considered that the standards were met, because the content of the programme was appropriately aligned with professional guidelines, with professional expectations, and with relevant HCPC standards. They had also seen evidence that there were mechanisms for updating the programme as necessary
- **SET 5: Practice-based learning** –
    - The visitors reviewed module descriptors, alongside the Development Tracker document, and various mapping exercises. These set out which SOPs and which BPS Core Competencies (CCs) would be met by which parts of the practice-based learning. Additionally, the education provider mapped the BPS CCs to the SOPs, to further explain the objectives of practice-based learning.
    - The education provider also noted that “the programme is designed around research, practice, academic which integrate and develop throughout the 3 years.” This aims to ensure that the learners are learning theory elements and clinical elements in an integrated way.
    - Regarding the supervision by practice educators, the visitors reviewed a narrative stating that all learners would have a practice tutor to oversee all aspects of their practice-based learning. The practice educator is allocated by the Local Authority Psychological Service (LAPS), and those individuals will be supported via regular meetings with the education provider, specifically in the form of the link tutor. Learners will have weekly supervisions while on placement. It is specifically required that practice tutors must be qualified and registered educational psychologists who are employed by a LAPS. All practice tutors will therefore be practising according to HCPC SOPs and currently registered.
    - The visitors considered that the relevant SETs were now met. This was because they had seen clear evidence that the education provider would be able to provide practice-based learning which was appropriately integrated with the objectives of the programme, and that placements would be overseen by appropriate qualified staff.
- **SET 6: Assessment** –
    - The education provider stated that all learners’ work on the programme would be aligned with Level 12 doctoral criteria, BPS core competencies and the HCPC SETS and SOPs.The programme specifications and module specifications contained information about how each module would be assessed, including the various kinds of assessment used. The overall approach is aligned with the education provider’s institutional policies, which cover matters like resubmissions, extensions, retrieval and time permitted for programme completion. The education provider stated that they would be using a mixed approach to assessment as approved by internal accreditation. In practice this meant that work would be submitted via TurnItIn and

moderated anonymously. They added that for aspects of placement and reflective assessment pieces a qualitative approach will use a pass/fail with amendments approach.

- Regarding alignment with the SCPEs, the education provider noted their "Professionalism" theme, which ensured that all assessment would include a focus on the SCPEs. This was made clear through a mapping document. They stated that "teaching activities have been designed to support students' understanding" of professionalism.
- Citing the module specifications, the general handbook and the development tracker, the education provider explained how they will assess learners through the following methods:
  - Coursework including essays, reports, presentations and a thesis;
  - Placement portfolios
  - Clinical placement assessment.

  The development tracker will show each learners' progress over the course of the programme.
- The visitors considered that the relevant standards were now met. This was because the education provider had demonstrated that assessment would cover all the necessary areas for the HCPC SOPs and SCPEs. They had also shown that there would be an appropriately varied range of assessments for establishing whether learners had developed the necessary knowledge and competencies.

As part of the stage 2 review, we also considered information about service user involvement, EDI, and interprofessional education (IP. The education provider expanded on these issues in a virtual meeting, noting that service user involvement and IPE would be managed through the NSSGEP discussed above, and that EDI monitoring and assurance would be undertaken by university-level policies.

Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities:

- Library and electronic resource centre
- Virtual learning environment for learners to submit work and to liaise with programme staff and practice educators
- Workplace resources including access to NHS Trust libraries and study spaces

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None.

**Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:**

## Section 5: Referrals

This section summarises any areas which require further follow-up through a separate quality assurance process (the approval, focused review, or performance review process).

There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process.

**Recommendations**

We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. They do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the programme learning outcomes to ensure that they cover all the appropriate knowledge and skills that learners will be expected to acquire.

**Reason:** The visitors were able to review all the programme learning outcomes and considered that overall they were appropriate and would enable learners to meet all the standards of proficiency (SOPs). They did consider, however, that some of the learning outcomes lacked specificity about the exact skills and competencies that would need to be achieved. They considered this raised a minor risk that some learners might not have a clear idea of everything they needed to understand. The education provider noted, when we explored this with them, that they had framed the learning outcomes according to institutional norms.

The visitors considered this was a minor risk so did not need to be explored further through quality activity or conditions, but they did suggest that the education provider may wish to reflect on how best to frame learning outcomes to ensure they are as specific as possible.

## Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes

**Assessment panel recommendation**

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that the programme should be approved subject to the conditions being met.

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that all standards are met, and therefore the programme. should be approved.

**Education and Training Committee decision**

Education and Training Committee considered the assessment panel's recommendations and the findings which support these. The education provider was also provided with the opportunity to submit any observation they had on the conclusions reached.

Based on all information presented to them, the Committee decided that the programme is approved.

**Reason for this decision:** The Panel accepted the visitor's recommendation that programme should receive approval

## Appendix 1 – summary report

If the education provider does not provide observations, only this summary report (rather than the whole report) will be provided to the Education and Training Committee (Panel) to enable their decision on approval. The lead visitors confirm this is an accurate summary of their recommendation, and the nature, quality and facilities of the provision.

| Education provider | Case reference | Lead visitors | Quality of provision | Facilities provided |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| University of Dundee | CAS-01702-H9Z3N7 | Garrett Kennedy<br>Sasha Hall | Through this assessment, we have noted the following areas of best practice:<br>o Oversight of guest lecturers and broad interdisciplinary input enriches the learning experience and maintains academic standards<br>o Use of disability plans and early support mechanisms demonstrate commitment to accessibility<br>o The 3-strand model promotes the integration of theory and practice<br>o Strong links between University and placement services, and clear supervision structure.<br>o Ensures high standards by requiring all educators to be practising and registered professionals.<br>o The use of multiple assessments in recruitment | Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities:<br>• Library and electronic resource centre<br>• Virtual learning environment for learners to submit work and to liaise with programme staff and practice educators<br>• Workplace resources including access to NHS Trust libraries and study spaces |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | ensures robust selection of applicants<br>o Professional behaviour is integrated throughout both academic and placement learning<br>o Integration of research, practice, and theory ensures alignment with current expectations.<br>o Strong engagement with stakeholders ensures up-to-date content.<br>o Embeds integration as a core design principle, not an add-on.<br>o emphasis on reflexivity and critical engagement supports professional growth.<br>o Embedded evidence-based principles from the start of training.<br>o Professional conduct is assessed across modules and learning activities, not in isolation (6.5) | |

| Programmes | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Programme name** | **Mode of study** | **Nature of provision** |
| Doctorate in Applied Educational Psychology (DAppEdPsy) | FT (Full time) | Taught (HEI) |

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

| Name | Mode of study | Profession | Modality | Annotation | First intake date |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 11) | PT (Part time) | | | Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing | 01/02/2014 |
| Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 11) | PT (Part time) | | | Supplementary prescribing | 01/09/2007 |
| Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 9) | PT (Part time) | | | Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing | 01/02/2014 |
| Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 9) | PT (Part time) | | | Supplementary prescribing | 01/09/2007 |