

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	3
Section five: Visitors' comments	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Association of Clinical Scientists
Programme title	Certificate of Attainment
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Clinical Scientist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Geraldine Hartshorne (Clinical scientist) Ruth Ashbee (Clinical scientist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of postal review	2 August 2015

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report 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 no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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

Reason: The Annual Report of the Association of Clinical Scientists (2013) has some elements which address internal quality for two years ago (academic year 2012-13), but no documentation was provided as part of this audit which addressed the quality monitoring process which had been undertaken for the previous academic year (2013-14). The visitors were also unclear how this document related to the external monitoring procedures for the programme and how outcomes from those procedures were considered by the education provider and addressed if required. As such the visitors could not identify, from the evidence provided, how the regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place on the programme were being operated regularly and how the outcomes of these systems were being utilised to ensure the programme is being delivered effectively. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to determine that the regular monitoring and evaluation systems have been in place for the period required (2012-13 and 2013-14) and that these systems have been utilised by the education provider to ensure that the programme is being run effectively across all the disciplines covered.

Suggested documentation: Internal audit or quality reports covering the entire period required for this audit and an indication of how these reports utilise the external monitoring processes to ensure the continued effective delivery of the programme.

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

Reason: From the evidence provided the visitors were clear that external moderation of the assessment procedures on this programme had been undertaken in 2015 and that previous external moderation had been considered from 2013 and the 2014-15 academic year. However, the visitors could not identify, from this submission, if the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms were in place for the 2012-13 academic year and how these mechanisms had been used to ensure the appropriate standards in the assessment. The visitors also noted that the summary document identifying how many external moderation assessments had been undertaken indicated that there was no need to respond to the external assessors, but did not detail why there was no required response. As such the visitors could not determine how the mechanisms in place were being used effectively to ensure the appropriate standards in the assessment of students on the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to how the external monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place are being used to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment of students on this programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence of the external monitoring and evaluation systems that were in place across the academic years required (2012-13 and 2013-14). Information regarding how the reports generated by these mechanisms are considered by the education provider to ensure that there consistent standards are applied in the assessment of students.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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 have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

Section five: Visitors' comments

As in previous years, the visitors noted that the third party review reports included the names of the candidates taking the assessment. The visitors would like to remind the education provider that the HCPC does not require reports containing personal details and that they should provide anonymised reports in the future. As this has been mentioned before it is disappointing that this has not been noted by the education provider as the reports again include the names of the individuals undergoing assessment.

Annual monitoring visitors' 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

Name of education provider	University of Manchester
Programme title	Doctorate in Counselling Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Counselling psychologist
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dave Packwood (Counselling psychologist) Tony Ward (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive	Mandy Hargood
Date of assessment day / postal review	11 August 2015

Section two: Submission details

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

- A completed HCPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External examiner's report 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
 - Postgraduate research committee minutes 23 October 2012
 - Postgraduate research committee minutes 11 December 2012
 - Postgraduate research committee minutes 12 February 2013
 - Postgraduate research committee minutes 19 March 2013
 - Postgraduate research committee minutes 7 May 2013
 - Postgraduate research committee minutes item on academic engagement librarian

- Postgraduate research committee item on attendance regulations and policy
- 3 Excel files, presenting student outcome data to Postgraduate research committee minutes
- File on fieldwork survey

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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

Reason: The visitors considered the internal quality documents provided by the education provider. These were postgraduate research committee minutes over the last two years. Whilst some aspect of how the programme operated was discussed within the minutes, they did not clearly indicate that the programme has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place. On reading the minutes the visitors noticed that an annual review for the School had taken place. However, as they did not receive this they cannot be sure that this would show that the standard continues to be met. Therefore the visitors would like to see evidence that demonstrates that the programme has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Suggested documentation: The annual school review or other evidence that demonstrates the programme has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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 have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.