hpc health professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Sheffield
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	16 – 17 May 2012

Contents

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 psychology 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. 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	Sabiha Azmi (Clinical psychologist) Nicola Bowes (Forensic psychologist)
HPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	18 per cohort
First approved intake	January 1990
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2012
Chair	Alistair Warren (University of Sheffield)
Secretary	Sue Davison (University of Sheffield)
Members of the joint panel	Liz Anderson (British Psychological Society) Geraldine Kavanagh (British Psychological Society) Mary O'Reilly (British Psychological Society) Tom Patterson (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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐
SET and SOP Appendices	☒	☐	☐
Annual feedback report and annual report November 2011	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement information	☒	☐	☐

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

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 ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 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 number of recommendations 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

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 revisit the programme and admissions documentation to ensure it is consistent, reflective of current terminology used and gives all the information applicants require.

Reason: From a review of the programme and admissions documentation the visitors noted a number of instances where out of date terminology is used and where further clarifications should be added. In several places the criminal conviction checks required for admissions was referred to as "police checks" (Clearing house entry, SET and SOP appendices, appendix 2.1a) or "CRB (Criminal Records Bureau) Police Check" (Selection 2012 Administrative Details, SET and SOP appendices, appendix 2.1e). The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme and admissions documentation to clarify the criminal convictions check undertaken is an enhanced CRB (Criminal Records Bureau) check. The visitors additionally noted the programme team should be more pro-active in informing potential applicants of information surrounding the occupational health check processes in place, in particular the support available if anything is declared through the occupational health check. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit programme and admissions documentation to ensure it is consistent, reflective of current terminology used and gives all the information applicants require.

3.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how they recruit external speakers; how they ensure external speakers have relevant specialist expertise and up to date knowledge; and how they guarantee the quality of their teaching.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors noted local NHS clinical psychologists are integral to the delivery of the curriculum as external speakers. The visitors noted 'teaching feedback' was submitted by students at the end of each speaker's session. The visitors however, could not clearly determine what recruitment mechanisms were in place or how the programme team would ensure external speakers have the specialist expertise and relevant up to date knowledge to be able to ensure students would meet the relevant learning outcomes for the session. Additionally the visitors could not determine how the programme team guaranteed the quality of the external speakers' teaching. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team recruits, guarantees and safeguards the quality of the teaching of the external speakers.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate how they ensure supervisors have undertaken appropriate initial training and undertake regular refresher training to work with students from this programme.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit provided some information as to the nature of the training undertaken by supervisors for this programme. It was indicated the programme undertakes a joint training programme (Supervisor Training and Recognition (STAR)) with two other clinical psychology programmes delivered in the area which has been agreed by the British Psychological Society (BPS) as a structure for all applied psychology supervision. The visitors were satisfied supervisors were being appropriately trained in supervision however could not determine how the programme team ensured that training on programme specific information was undertaken. The visitors could not determine whether programme specific training was a mandatory requirement before supervisors worked with students. The visitors could also not determine how the programme team ensured that initial and refresher training was being undertaken and so whether they were able to take steps to ensure appropriate training is undertaken by supervisors when necessary. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide further information to demonstrate how they ensure supervisors have undertaken appropriate initial training and undertake regular refresher training to work with students from this programme.

Recommendations

2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider create a programme specific equality and diversity strategy to help widen access to the programme as much as possible.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors noted evidence of equality and diversity policies in the admissions procedures and evidence of the monitoring of the policies. The visitors noted the programme came under the faculty's equality and diversity policies and is considered alongside the other programmes in the faculty. The visitors suggest the programme team consider formulating a programme specific equality and diversity strategy with long and short term actions, and with senior team input to ensure the work that is currently being undertaken around widening access to the programme is conducted in a way that is specific for the programme.

3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider revisit the programme documentation to ensure there are no inaccuracies.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation submitted prior to the visit there were some slight inaccuracies in terminology which were not detrimental to the students learning however could create some confusion. For example, the Trainees' Information Pack (section 7, p30) refers to the HPC's Guidance on conduct and ethics for students as the "HPC Code of Conduct and Ethics for Students". The visitors suggest the programme team revisit the programme documentation to check and correct any inaccuracies.

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.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team consider giving supervisors and students' further guidance around attendance and annual leave.

Reason: Discussions with the students highlighted they found it difficult to use their annual leave entitlements through the year due to the timing requirements of the programme. Discussions with the supervisors highlighted there had been a few noted problems with students booking annual leave for during the duration of a placement. Due to the organisation schedule of placements the supervisor had planned the student's case load and then discovered the student had booked annual leave during the placement. This led to disruptions with the

organisation of the placement for the supervisor and the student. The visitors suggest the programme team consider if they can give further guidance around annual leave, and use the students and supervisors experiences to come up with an approach that is suitable for all parties and ensures minimal impact to placement arrangement.

<div align="right">
Sabiha Azmi
Nicola Bowes
</div>