

Approval process quality report

Education provider	University of Derby
Name of programme(s)	Post Graduate Diploma in Forensic Psychology Practice (Full time) Post Graduate Diploma in Forensic Psychology Practice (Part time)
Date Assessment commenced	10/08/2021
Visitor recommendation made	02/11/2021
Case reference	CAS-01070-M1Q9L7

Summary of findings from this assessment

This a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the College of Health, Psychology and Social Care - Post Graduate Diploma in Forensic Psychology programmes detailed in this report meet our Standards of Education and Training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

The outcomes of this process were as follows:

- Visitor-led Stage 1 assessment was not required based on the new programme(s) being proposed for delivery aligning to existing provision at the provider
- The visitors recommended the programme(s) be approved as all programme level standards were met through their Stage 2 assessment.

The Education and Training Committee will now meet to consider the visitors recommendations and make a decision regarding programme approval.

The areas we cover in this report

Approval process quality report	1
Summary of findings from this assessment	1
Section 1: Background information	3
Who we are	3
Our standards	3
Our approach to quality assuring education	3
The approval process	3
How we make decisions	4
Section 2: Our assessment	5
Stage 1 assessment: The institution	5
Stage 2 assessment: The programmes	6
Summary of visitor findings	9
Section 3: The visitors' recommendations	10
Programme approval	10
Section 4: Committee decision on approval	10

Section 1: Background information

Who we are

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.

Our standards

We approve institutions 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 standards are divided into two levels based on their relevance to the institution and programme(s). The following considerations were made when splitting standards between institution and programme level:

- Where accountability best sits, with either the accountable person for the institution or programme
- How the standard is worded, with references to the education provider and processes often best sitting at the institution level, and references to the programme or profession often best sitting at the programme level
- We have preferred seeking assurance at the institution level, to fit with our intention to put the institution at the centre of our quality assurance model.

Our approach to quality assuring education

We are flexible, intelligent and data-led in our quality assurance of institution 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
- engage at the organisation, profession and programme levels to enhance our ability to assess the impact of risks and issues on HCPC standards

Institutions 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

We take a staged approach to quality assurance, as we need to understand practices which will support delivery of all programmes within an institution, prior to assessing the programme level detail. The approval process is formed of two stages:

- Stage 1 – we assess to be assured 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 process we will initially review the proposal and then design our assessment based on the issues we find. As such the assessment methods will be different based on the issues which arise in each case.

How we make 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 of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. 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 meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

Section 2: Our assessment

Stage 1 assessment: The institution

Education provider	University of Derby
Institution	College of Health, Psychology and Social Care
Key contact	Denise Baker

As part of the initiation of the process the education provider indicated that the proposed programmes would be part of College of Health, Psychology and Social Care. This institution is well established with HCPC and currently delivers approved programmes in:

- Occupational Therapy; and
- Diagnostic Radiography

In previous standards assessments of these programmes, visitors have established the institution level standards are met. The provider has also demonstrated this through ongoing monitoring carried out by the HCPC.

As part of the provider's definition of their institution, they have defined the policies, procedures and processes that apply to the programmes delivered within it. These relate to the institution level standards we set which ensure the following areas are managed effectively:

Admissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Information for applicants• Assessing English language, character, and health• Prior learning and experience (AP(E)L)• Equality, diversity and inclusion
Programme governance, management and leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Effective programme delivery• Effective staff management• Partnerships, which are managed at the institution level
Quality, monitoring and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Academic components, including how curricula are kept up to date• Practice components, including the establishment of safe and supporting practice learning environments• Learner involvement• Service user and carer involvement
Learners	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support• Ongoing professional suitability• Learning with and from other learners and professionals (IPL/E)• Equality, diversity and inclusion
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objectivity• Progression and achievement• Appeals

Assurance that institution level standards are met

As part of this stage we considered how the proposed programmes fit into the named institution by considering any notable changes to the policies, procedures and processes related to the areas above.

We considered how the proposed programmes are assimilated with the management of existing approved programmes in the institution. We determined the proposed programmes would be managed in way that was consistent with the definition of their institution. On this basis, we were satisfied it is appropriate to take assurance the institution level standards will continue to be met by the introduction of these programmes.

Stage 2 assessment: The programmes

Education provider	University of Derby
Institution	College of Health, Psychology and Social Care
Accountable person (for the programmes)	Denise Baker
Programme	Post Graduate Diploma in Forensic Psychology Practice
Mode of study	Part time
Programme duration	48 months
Learner numbers	7
Intakes per year	3
Qualification	PGDip
Start date	01/01/2022

Education provider	University of Derby
Institution	College of Health, Psychology and Social Care
Accountable person (for the programmes)	Denise Baker
Programme	Post Graduate Diploma in Forensic Psychology Practice
Mode of study	Full time
Programme duration	24 months
Learner numbers	8
Intakes per year	3
Qualification	PGDip
Start date	01/01/2022

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.

We also considered other sources of information, intelligence, and data points as noted in the table below:

Performance area	Data point / comparison	Benchmark	Data	Score	Executive comments
Performance indicator	Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	185	172	-0.01	This data point is for all the existing programmes within the institution, for the last academic year. This has resulted in a negative score because the actual total learner numbers is higher than the benchmark value. This occurred across the occupational therapy and radiography programmes, within this institution.
Performance indicator	Aggregation of percentage not continuing	9.8	10.3	-0.05	We collected this data from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA). The score, indicates the education provider has scored below the benchmark and is performing slightly below the minimum good score.
Performance indicator	Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	94.6	96	0.02	We collected this data from the HESA. The score, indicates the education provider is above the minimum threshold of a good score of 0. This indicated the education providers is performing well in this area.
Teaching quality	TEF award	N/A	Gold	0.00	The data point 'Gold' is the highest score in this area. This indicates the education provider is performing well in this area
Learner / graduate satisfaction	NSS overall satisfaction score (Q27)	74.83	77.66	0.04	We collect this data from the Office for Students (OfS).. This score indicates the education provider is performing well in this area
Total				0.93	This overall score is considered a very high score as it is close to the maximum score of 1. This indicates the education

					provider is performing very well overall.
--	--	--	--	--	---

Visitors appointed to undertake this assessment

We appointed the following panel to assess the above information against our programme level standards:

Registrant visitors	Sally Evans – Practitioner psychologist
	Jennifer Caldwell – Occupational therapist

Assessment of the proposal

Initial review:

- The visitors reviewed the education provider's submission and considered their approach to each standard.
- This first review culminated in a virtual HCPC meeting in which the visitors discussed and made decisions around the standards they considered to be met and the areas they required further information around.
- Following the finalisation of areas to explore the visitors discussed and finalised the most appropriate quality activity to undertake this investigation.

Quality activity: Email response to questions

We design our assessment to be proportionate and appropriate to the issues identified and to seek input from relevant stakeholders when necessary. We considered it was appropriate and proportionate to consider additional information via email response to questions.

The themes we explored are as follows:

Theme	Reason for email response to questions
Ensuring applicants are made aware of the selection and entry criteria, as part of the admissions process	Visitors were unclear as to how applicants will be made aware of the requirement for them to find their practice-based learning prior to starting on either of the programmes. As this was one of the requirements of admissions, visitors sought clarification about how this requirement will be conveyed and made available to applicants as part of the admissions process.
Ensuring resources for the programmes are effective and appropriate to support learners, for the delivery of the proposed programmes	Visitors could not locate information regarding resources, specifically physical resources for the proposed programmes. As such, they asked for further evidence regarding this and how the education provider will ensure these resources are adequate and effective, to support learners on these proposed programmes.

Clarity on range of placements which will be on offer, for learners on the proposed programmes	Visitors noted 'The Supervisor' will be responsible for managing the practice-based learning, along with ensuring learners will have access to the required breadth and range of practice-based learning. However, visitors could not locate any information regarding what range of practice-based learning will be on offer for learners on these programmes.
How the education provider ensures practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.	Visitors understood that learners need to identify an appropriately qualified and experienced registered psychologist as a supervisor, prior to joining these programmes. From reviewing the submission, visitors could not identify what the minimum expected qualification and experience is for practice educators to possess, to be able to support learners on these programmes. Additionally, visitors wanted clarity who makes a decision on the suitability of practice educators including keeping an audit, on the practice-based learning chosen by the learner.

From their detailed review of the responses submitted, the visitors were satisfied with the clarification provided to address all of the queries identified above.

Summary of visitor findings

SET 1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register

The visitors were satisfied that the programmes' align with the level of qualification expected for entry onto the HCPC Register. On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area.

SET 2: Programme admissions

Visitors considered the information submitted as part of the evidence was very well detailed. It contained clear information about the academic, professional entry and selection criteria for these programmes. The education provider highlighted their requirements for direct entry onto the programmes, that the visitors considered appropriate and suitable for applicants. On this basis and from the queries raised during the quality activity, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership

The education provider demonstrated the availability of sufficient and adequate resources, including digital and physical resources that would effectively support learners in the delivery of the proposed programmes. The education provider also demonstrated the profile of their programme team, along with providing clear information regarding their qualifications and experience. This along with the use of associate lecturers was adequate to support the required teaching activities, for the

proposed learner numbers on these programmes. On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

SET 4: Programme design and delivery

The visitors considered the programme curriculum to be appropriate for learners to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) and be suitably prepared for practice. They also noted learning outcomes were clearly mapped to the SOPs. Visitors also noted expectations of professional behaviour, including standards of conduct, performance and ethics professional was explained clearly within the documents. Visitors noted the blended learning approach was appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes. Visitors also considered the evidence provided demonstrated a clear integration of theory and practice, with a clear linkage between the two. On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

SET 5: Practice-based learning

Visitors noted learners are expected to have a practice-based learning arrangement and clinical supervisor agreed, prior to joining the proposed programmes. Through the quality activity, visitors were able to determine the range of practice-based learning and how auditing will take place. Additionally, visitors were satisfied about how the education provider will check there will be adequate practice educators with the necessary knowledge and experience to support learners on these programmes. On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

SET 6: Assessment

The visitors noted the assessment strategy aligned with curriculum which would enable learners to demonstrate the learning outcomes and SOPs. Additionally, visitors considered the assessment policies were clear in terms of progression and achievement on the respective programmes. On this basis, there were no conditions set in relation to this area of the standards.

Section 3: The visitors' recommendations

Based on these findings the visitors made the following recommendations to the Education and Training Committee:

Programme approval

The programme is recommended for approval, without conditions.

Section 4: Committee decision on approval

At their meeting on 7 December 2021, the Education and Training Committee agreed with the visitors recommendation and approved the programme(s)