

## New profession monitoring report

### Contents

Section One: Programme Details .....	1
Section Two: Submission Details .....	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation .....	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s) .....	2

### Section One: Programme Details

<b>Education provider</b>	City University
<b>Programme name</b>	Doctorate in Health Psychology (Dpsych)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>HPC visitor(s)</b>	Tim Moss (Health Psychologist) Trevor Holme (Educational Psychologist)
<b>Education executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	25 May 2010

### Section Two: Submission Details

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's Report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

### **Section Three: Additional Documentation**

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

#### **Reason**

The visitors would like to seek clarification of the role of the programme external examiner as they were unclear of the role the external examiner was taking in terms of the quality assurance of the programme. From the external examiner reports provided there was an indication that the programme external examiner was participating in viva voce examinations and other assessment processes. It was not clear if this included the final viva voce examination for the thesis leading to the final award. Therefore the visitors would like to receive evidence to demonstrate the programme regulations for the role of external examiners to all aspects of the programme.

### **Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)**

The approval visit scheduled for the academic year 2011/2012 is the most appropriate method to assess the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs).

<b>Date</b>	<b>Ver.</b>	<b>Dept/Cmte</b>	<b>Doc Type</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Int. Aud.</b>
2010-08-16	b	EDU	PPR	NP report City Doc PPH FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## New profession monitoring report

### Contents

Section One: Programme Details .....	1
Section Two: Submission Details .....	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation .....	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

### Section One: Programme Details

<b>Education provider</b>	University of Edinburgh
<b>Programme name</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Flexible
<b>HPC visitor(s)</b>	Tim Moss (Health Psychologist) Laura Golding (Clinical Psychologist)
<b>Education executive</b>	Mandy Hargood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	25 May 2010

### Section Two: Submission Details

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
  - Internal quality report for one year ago
  - Internal quality report for two years ago
  - External Examiner's for one year ago
  - External Examiner's Report for two years ago
  - Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
  - Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Curriculum Committee terms of reference
  - Memo Evidence of Quality Assurance Process for the Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy) at University of Edinburgh
  - Curriculum Committee minutes
  - School Quality report
  - Staff – student liaison committee minutes

### **Section Three: Additional Documentation**

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

#### **Reason**

In their reading of the documentation for the programme the visitors found that the composite monitoring report for the School reported that the governance for regulating the quality committees for the School had been reviewed, and that until the new governance regulations were in place the quality committees had been suspended.

Therefore the visitors would like to receive the updated internal quality assurance governance processes in place after the review as described in the preliminary response to the QQR report dated January 2009, so that they can be assured that the quality assurance mechanisms in place for the programme are robust.

### **Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)**

The approval visit scheduled for the academic year 2011/2012 is the most appropriate method to assess the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs).

<b>Date</b>	<b>Ver.</b>	<b>Dept/Cmte</b>	<b>Doc Type</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Int. Aud.</b>
2010-07-23	b	EDU	PPR	NP report Edinburgh Doc PPCL FT & Flexible	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

## New profession monitoring report

### Contents

Section One: Programme Details .....	1
Section Two: Submission Details .....	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation .....	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	2

### Section One: Programme Details

<b>Education provider</b>	University of Lancaster
<b>Programme name</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>HPC visitors</b>	Allan Winthrop (Counselling Psychologist) Sabiha Azmi (Clinical Psychologist)
<b>Education executive</b>	Ben Potter
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	25 May 2010

### Section Two: Submission Details

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
  - Internal quality report for one year ago
  - Internal quality report for two years ago
  - External Examiner's for one year ago
  - External Examiner's Report for two years ago
  - Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
  - Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Annual Review Meeting notes February 2008 Lancaster
  - Email - outlining documentation rationale
  - Final Lancaster Action plan 09-10
  - Noelle EE2nd08-09
  - Progress with QA action plan - quarterly review May 2007
  - Quarterly review of the Action Plan October 2009 (and (2))
  - Reply to Noelle 2

### Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

#### Reason

The visitors noted that on the annual monitoring audit form submitted by the education provider that they provided an annual report for the academic year 2007-2008. However the visitors' also noted that Dr Noelle Robertson's 2007-2008 and 2008 -2009 external examiners reports provided were duplicates of one another as were the programme team's responses to those reports. The visitors therefore require clarification about this, and the external examiners report for the year missed as a consequence of this duplication. These documents are requested on the HPC annual monitoring audit form to allow the visitors to gain a good depth of knowledge about how the programme has developed over this period.

The visitors also noted that on the annual monitoring audit form submitted by the education provider that they indicated that they had provided an internal quality reports for the academic years 2007-2008 and 2008-2009. However the visitors could not identify these documents within the submission with the only document addressing the internal quality of the programme the 'Responses to the British Psychological Society following the accreditation visit to the doctoral programme in clinical psychology October 2007'. The visitors stated that this did not fulfil the requirements of the annual monitoring audit form as it was not ostensibly an internal quality document and it did not cover the years stated. Therefore the visitors require the internal quality documents from 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 to be confident that there were no significant issues which were affecting the programme.

### Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors

The approval visit scheduled for the academic year 2011/2012 is the most appropriate method to assess the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs).

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-30	b	EDU	PPR	NP report - Lancaster - Doc PPCL - FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

## New profession monitoring report

### Contents

Section One: Programme Details .....	1
Section Two: Submission Details .....	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation .....	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	3

### Section One: Programme Details

<b>Education provider</b>	Newcastle University
<b>Programme name</b>	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsychol)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>HPC visitor(s)</b>	Ruth Baker (Clinical Psychologist) Laura Golding (Clinical Psychologist) Harry Brick (Clinical Psychologist)
<b>Education executive</b>	Ruth Wood
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	25 May 2010

### Section Two: Submission Details

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's Report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

### Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

#### Reason

The visitors were concerned by some points raised in the Annual monitoring reports for which they felt further evidence was required from the education provider to reassure them about the programmes programme management and resources.

Both annual report forms have noted the issue of teaching rooms; the action plan for 2010-2011 (at the end of 2008-2009) details the ongoing plan to identify more suitable teaching rooms and to look toward the provision of a dedicated teaching room within the school. The visitors were concerned that the lack of teaching room could cause potential problems for the programme and require further evidence from the education provider that they are continuing to follow up on the action plan provided (2010-2011).

The annual report forms (2008-2009) have noted the need to increase the research supervisor resource for the programme. This has been noted in the attached action plan for 2010-2011. The action plan has identified the strategy to review the situation with tutors and the head of school and stated that by Autumn 2010 the action would be complete. The visitors were concerned with the provision of supervisors and the implications this could have on the programme and therefore require further evidence from the education provider that they are continuing to follow up on the action plan provided (2010-2011).

The external examiners reports provided did not give a complete overview of the external examination that the programme is subject to. The Annual report form 2008-2009 states that "all 5 external examiners have complimented the programme over the past year". The education provider only provided two external examiners reports for the academic year 2008-2009 for this submission and while they do provide an assessment of the programme the visitors felt a greater overview of the programme would be provided by looking at all reports together. The visitors would therefore require further evidence that the programme undergoes external scrutiny and that the external reports and responses are dealt with appropriately.

The visitors have noted from the Annual report form 2008-2009 that commissions for 2010 entry have dropped from 18 to 15 and that the education provider received no explanation for this reduction. The visitors require further evidence and clarifications regarding this statement including the plans in place to deal with this reduction and information regarding the relationship the programme has with commissioning bodies.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-06-28	b	EDU	PPR	NP report Newcastle - Doctorate PPCL - FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None



#### **Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)**

The approval visit scheduled for the academic year 2011/2012 is the most appropriate method to assess the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs).

<b>Date</b>	<b>Ver.</b>	<b>Dept/Cmte</b>	<b>Doc Type</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Int. Aud.</b>
2010-06-28	b	EDU	PPR	NP report Newcastle - Doctorate PPCL - FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

## New profession monitoring report

### Contents

Section One: Programme Details .....	1
Section Two: Submission Details .....	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation .....	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	2

### Section One: Programme Details

<b>Education provider</b>	New School of Psychotherapy & Counselling & Middlesex University
<b>Awarding institution</b>	Middlesex University
<b>Programme name</b>	Existential Counselling Psychology and Psychotherapy (Dpsych)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>HPC visitors</b>	Allan Winthrop (Counselling Psychologist) Sabiha Azmi (Clinical Psychologist)
<b>Education executive</b>	Ben Potter
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	25 May 2010

### Section Two: Submission Details

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's Report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

### Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

#### Reason

The visitors noted that on the Annual monitoring audit form submitted by the education provider that they provided an annual report for the academic year 2007-2008. However the visitors were unclear as to which report this referred to. Franz Lohman's report states that it is from the academic year 2006-2007 but refers to dealing with the 2007-2008 cohort. The visitors therefore require clarification about this, and an external examiners report and programme team response, from 2007-2008 as requested on the HPC annual monitoring audit form to gain a good depth of knowledge about how the programme has developed.

The visitors also require a list of staff as well as the numbers of students currently in each cohort in order for the visitors to clearly identify the number of staff delivering the programme and to ensure the staffing resources are adequate. This is to ensure that there is sufficient staff in place to deliver the programme and ensure that students completing the course are meeting the learning outcomes.

### Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors

The approval visit scheduled for the academic year 2011/2012 is the most appropriate method to assess the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs).

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-08-13	b	EDU	PPR	NP report - N.Schl of Psyc & Couns - Doc PPCO - FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

## New profession monitoring report

### Contents

Section One: Programme Details .....	1
Section Two: Submission Details .....	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation .....	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors .....	2

### Section One: Programme Details

<b>Education provider</b>	New School of Psychotherapy & Counselling & Middlesex University
<b>Awarding institution</b>	Middlesex University
<b>Programme name</b>	Existential Counselling Psychology and Psychotherapy (Dpsych)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>HPC visitors</b>	Allan Winthrop (Counselling Psychologist) Sabiha Azmi (Clinical Psychologist)
<b>Education executive</b>	Ben Potter
<b>Date of assessment day</b>	25 May 2010

### Section Two: Submission Details

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's Report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

### Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

#### Reason

The visitors noted that on the Annual monitoring audit form submitted by the education provider that they provided an annual report for the academic year 2007-2008. However the visitors were unclear as to which report this referred to. Franz Lohman's report states that it is from the academic year 2006-2007 but refers to dealing with the 2007-2008 cohort. The visitors therefore require clarification about this, and an external examiners report and programme team response, from 2007-2008 as requested on the HPC annual monitoring audit form to gain a good depth of knowledge about how the programme has developed.

The visitors also require a list of staff as well as the numbers of students currently in each cohort in order for the visitors to clearly identify the number of staff delivering the programme and to ensure the staffing resources are adequate. This is to ensure that there is sufficient staff in place to deliver the programme and ensure that students completing the course are meeting the learning outcomes.

### Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors

The approval visit scheduled for the academic year 2011/2012 is the most appropriate method to assess the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs).

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-08-13	b	EDU	PPR	NP report - N.Schl of Psyc & Couns - Doc PPCO - FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None