

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of East London
Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Clinical psychologist
Date of visit	17 – 18 May 2012

Contents

Contents.....	1
Executive summary.....	2
Introduction	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence.....	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions	6
Recommendations	7

Executive summary

The Health Professions Council (HPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HPC is a health regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HPC currently regulates 15 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Practitioner psychologist' or 'Clinical psychologist' must be registered with us. The HPC keep a register of health professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 11 October 2012. At the Committee meeting on 11 October 2012, the ongoing approval of the programme was re-confirmed. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

Introduction

The HPC visited the programme at the education provider as the practitioner psychologist profession came onto the register in July 2009 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event as the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The professional body and the HPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HPC visitors and profession	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Sandy Wolfson (Sport and exercise psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ben Potter
HPC observer	Niall Lennon
Proposed student numbers	31
First approved intake	January 1995
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Jacqui Potter (University of East London)
Secretary	Michael Wozniak (University of East London)
Members of the joint panel	Chris McCusker (British Psychological Society) Sheila Youngson (British Psychological Society) Gary Latchford (British Psychological Society) Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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

Condition: The programme team must clearly articulate, within the programme documentation the expected time after which they can reasonably expect feedback on assessments and pieces of work.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that the information regarding feedback is comprehensive. They also noted that the programme documentation did not specify any length of time in which a student could expect to receive feedback on a piece of work or the outcome of an assessment. However, in discussion with the students it was articulated that feedback was expected to be received by them after a period of 8 weeks but that this was not always the case and that feedback had been received by some students well after this period in some instances. In raising this issue with the programme team the visitors were made aware that the programme team has a target of 20 working days in which they aim to provide feedback to students. This meant that if the assessment or piece of work was undertaken prior to a holiday period or a period of extended leave then the feedback would not be returned within 8 weeks. The visitors therefore require the programme team to clearly articulate the policy around the provision of feedback to students in the programme documentation. In this way the programme team can ensure that students are aware of the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme, and that this standard continues to be met.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of where in the programme documentation it is clearly articulated that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not identify where it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to apply to the Register. The visitors were also unclear as to how this information is clearly communicated to students. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate where in the programme documentation it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to apply to the Register. In this way the visitors can be sure that this information is available to students and that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how best to support the work being done to capture the training experience of practice placement educators on the existing database of practice placements.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team it was made clear that they expected all practice placement educators to undertake the appropriate practice placement educator training which is provided. The visitors also noted that the programme team makes a note of those practice placement educators who have attended the initial training as well as the refresher training for more experienced educators. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard continues to be met. However, in further discussion with the programme team it was articulated that the information regarding a practice placement educators' training was captured in a system outside the main 'ACE' database. This had the implications of increasing the workload for the members of the programme team who were organising and arranging practice placements. In response to this the programme team have identified what needs to be done in order to include the practice placement educators' training data but that this has not yet been able to be undertaken. The visitors recommend that the education provider considers how best to support this continuing work in developing the 'ACE' database. In this way it may benefit from a reduction in staff time allocated to the arrangement of practice placements and an increase in time for staff to support the programme.

Sandy Wolfson
Ruth Baker