

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Liverpool John Moores University
<b>Programme name</b>	Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part Time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality</b>	Sport and Exercise Psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	14 – 15 December 2017

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	9

## Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Sport and exercise psychologist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care 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 approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 9 February 2017. At the Committee meeting on 25 May 2017, the programme was approved. 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 HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. 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 as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology. The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gareth Roderique-Davies (Health psychologist) Sandy Wolfson (Sport and exercise psychologist) Dee Keane (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Tamara Wasylec
Proposed student numbers	7 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 April 2017
Chair	Tony Hall
Secretary	Helen Summers
Members of the joint panel	Ian Maynard (The British Psychological Society) Lynne Evans (The British Psychological Society) Susan Quinn (The British Psychological Society) Lucy Horder (The British Psychological Society)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC did not review external examiner reports as none are available due to the programme not having previously run.

During the visit the HCPC 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"/>
Service users and carers	<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 (e.g. specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC met with a student from the Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology programme and received a written report from a student on the Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology. The HCPC also met with programme applicants.

The HCPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the programme does not require any specialist laboratories or teaching rooms.

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be satisfied 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 the relevant part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. 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 can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revise the programme documentation, including advertising materials to clearly articulate to applicants any additional costs that students may be liable to pay when on the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors could not see how the education provider informs students about the costs that students will have to pay as a result of taking a place on the programme. In the programme team meeting and in discussion with students the visitors heard there are costs which the students pay that are not stated in programme documentation, such as travel costs and professional body membership that must be paid when on the programme. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to identify how the admissions procedures give applicants the information they require about all costs incurred by the student, so they can make an informed choice to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

### **3.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence that demonstrates where students' attendance on placement is mandatory and how the associated attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that page 13 of the programme guide states that attendance is mandatory across the programme. However, in discussions with the programme team it was stated that should a student's attendance fall below 80 per cent, this would constitute a failure to progress on the programme. Therefore the visitors could not determine the requirement for attendance on the programme. From the discrepancies regarding the expectations of student attendance on the programme, the visitors were unable to determine the mandatory attendance level for students when on placement and how students are informed of this attendance policy, how it would be enforced and what, if any, repercussions there may be for students who fail to attend. As such, the visitors could not determine how the team ensured that students meet the requirement and subsequently meet the learning outcomes provided by the practice placement. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the attendance policy, what parts of the programme are mandatory and how this is communicated to students. The visitors also require evidence to demonstrate how the programme team satisfy themselves, through suitable checks or monitoring mechanisms, that the students meet the attendance requirement of the programme when on practice placement.

### **4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs).

**Reason:** From a review of the SETs and SOPs mapping documents the visitors noted references to HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics being assessed through learning outcomes one and two. However they were unable to find any evidence within the module guides under learning outcomes 1 and 2 to outline where HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were referred to in the curriculum. Although the programme team stated that students receive information about appropriate conduct, performance and ethics whilst on the programme the visitors still could not see how the education provider ensures that students understand these standards, including how and where they apply. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to identify how the curriculum ensures that students on the programme understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

**5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement, including information about an understanding of the expectations of professional conduct and lines of responsibility.

**Reason:**

In the programme team meeting the visitors heard that students may have no direct supervision when at their practice placements. The visitors could not see evidence of a process in place whereby the education provider or placement educator can identify issues should they arise on placement and how any issues regarding professional conduct would be identified, reported to the education provider and appropriate action taken. For instance, if a student was on placement in their own practice where they offered a service as a counselling psychotherapist and alternately provided a service as a trainee sport and exercise psychologist to the same service user, the visitors could not see what the process would be for identifying and reporting issues. In instances such as these the visitors were unable to see how the education provider ensures that issues are identified should they arise on placement and how any issues regarding professional conduct would be identified, reported to the education provider and appropriate action taken. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the process by which the education provider ensures that students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators are prepared for placements and have an understanding of their lines of responsibility and of expectations of professional conduct when on placement.

### **5.13 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence as to how they ensure that students, while on placement, introduce themselves appropriately and that service users are appropriately informed of any students' role in their care.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme leaders the visitors heard that students could use their place of employment or self-employment as their practice placement. In discussion with the programme team the visitors could not see how the education provider ensures that when students change from delivering a service as trained employee to delivering a service as a trainee/student that service users were clearly aware of their change in role. The visitors were also unclear about how the education provider ensures that service users are aware of the capacity in which students on this programme are working with them and how service users can choose not to receive the service delivered by this individual in their capacity as a trainee. In particular, the visitors could not identify how the education provider ensures that students identify themselves as students to service users in all practice placement settings. Therefore the visitors require further evidence as to the processes that the education provider has in place to ensure that the rights and needs of service users are respected throughout all practice placements and information about who the education provider is in these situations.

### **6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

**Reason:** From the evidence provided in module proforma 8001, 8002 and 8003, the visitors saw that students are required to attend 104 hours of lectures, tutorials and workshops over the course of the programme. The visitors also noted that students are required to complete 1500 placement hours over the course of the programme. In review of the programme guide, on page 13 the visitors noted that students are encouraged to attend all of the timetabled activity and that it is the student's responsibility to attend. This document also directs the reader to a web link for the university's attendance policy which applies to levels 3,4,5,6 & 7 but not Level 8 which is the level at which the students will be studying for this Doctoral level programme. Therefore visitors could not see how this policy applied to this programme. In discussion with the programme team the visitors heard that should student attendance fall below 80 per cent across all elements of the programme it would result in a student's failure to progress. However based on the evidence provided the visitors could not identify where this attendance requirement is located in programme documentation. As such the visitors are unclear what the attendance requirement is for this programme and how it is communicated to students. Therefore the visitors require further evidence stipulating the attendance requirements, how attendance is monitored across the programme including placements, the requirement for student progression and achievement and how this information is communicated to the students.



## Recommendations

### **3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider how they will broaden the membership of the service user group and ensure that service users continue to be involved in the programme.

**Reason:** Visitors were happy that the programme can meet this standard. However, during their meeting with service user and carers the visitors were made aware that that the person who attended the meeting was also a practice placement educator. It was also clear from discussions that there could potentially be limited opportunity for this person to interact with students on the programme, and that this could be determined by this service user and carer's availability or proximity to a students' practice placement site. Because of this the visitors felt that the range of service users involved in the stakeholder group was limited by the service users and carers' availability and that the programme team could potentially broaden the membership of the group. In doing this the programme team may include a greater variety of service users and carer input into the programme and provide a more flexible resource for the programme.

Dee Keane  
Sandy Wolfson  
Gareth Roderique-Davies