

New profession monitoring report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	University of Glasgow
Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Harry Brick (Clinical Psychologist) Judith Bamford (Educational Psychologist) George Delafield (Forensic Psychologist)
Education executive	Lewis Roberts
Date of assessment day / postal review	25 May 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's 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

Since External Examiner's reports were not provided by two examiners, the Exam Board minutes for last year and two years ago were provided. These minutes provide some opinions of the External Examiners on the Doctorate in Clinical Psychology programme.

- Glasgow University DClinPsy Exam Board Minutes 17 September 2009
- Glasgow University DClinPsy Exam Board Minutes 18 September 2008

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

An approval visit is required before and to replace the visit planned in the academic year 2011/2012 to assess the programme against the standards of education and training.

The reasons for this are as follows:

Reason

It is clear that the external examiners have raised serious issues through their reports. The visitors feel that the issues raised are serious enough for the visit to be brought forward.

The visitors noted a number of concerns around research skills in the programme. In particular the visitors noted that within the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) 2008–2009 the external examiner raised concerns about the trainee’s understanding of statistical skills. Trainee’s also requested statistic refresher teaching sessions in year 2. The visitors expressed concerns that a high number of trainee’s have failed the Service Based Evaluation project. The visitors were also concerned that students were not accessing university supervisors to address data management and conceptualisation issues.

The visitors expressed concerns about the support mechanisms in place for trainees; in particular supervisor support had been unavailable in Lanarkshire for over 3 years. The visitors were concerned that this means inadequate support for trainees in that region. The visitors noted that in the documentation trainees had to write formally to the programme director to express concerns around the quality of clinical supervisors and they felt unable to feedback directly to specific supervisors in a safe way.

Issues being raised are specifically trainee concerns around support and specific competencies, all of which would need to be reviewed through discussion with trainees and stakeholders.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-05-26	a	EDU	PPR	NP report Glasgow Doc PPCL FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

New profession monitoring report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	University of Lincoln University of Nottingham
Awarding institution (if different from education provider)	University of Lincoln University of Nottingham
Programme name	Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DclinPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Ruth Baker (Clinical Psychologist) Laura Golding (Clinical Psychologist) Harry Brick (Clinical Psychologist)
Education executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day / postal review	25 May 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

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

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's 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.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

An approval visit is required before and to replace the visit planned in the academic year 2011/2012 to assess the programme against the standards of education and training.

The reasons for this are as follows:

Reason

The visitors' assessment of the documentation provided for this submission has given the visitors enough of a concern to recommend bringing the scheduled visit for 2011/2012 forward. The documentation highlights significant concerns to programme management and resources.

The Annual monitoring reports (2007-2008 and 2008-2009) described problems with the business plan which potentially impact upon the security of the programme. In particular, the Annual monitoring report 2008-2009 highlighted potential problems with the transition from secondments to substantive contracts. It was also highlighted that the contracts between the East Midlands Health Workforce Deanery and the service level agreements were to be renewed during this academic year (2009-2010). It was not certain whether or not these would be "put out to tender or re-specified with the current education providers". The visitors were concerned with the future implications for this programme in light of the uncertainties detailed in the report.

The reports also highlighted some concerns with the split management of the programme between the two education providers and administration arrangements. This concern was reiterated within the external examiners reports for both years, in particular the "harmonisation of external examiner report requirements between the two universities and the synchronisation of reports with the timetable of the programme" (Annual report of external examiner for a taught course; Morris - session 2007-2008). Further concern with programme management was raised with the provision of resources at both sites. The Annual monitoring report 2008-2009 highlighted there was "no dedicated teaching space for the programme at either site". It was also noted that Nottingham University "was not in a position to provide sufficient space for the 2010 selection week". Some points in the resulting action plan have taken measures to rectify this problem but the visitors were concerned by the lack of space and resources overall and the impact this could have upon the programme.

The external examiners reports and responses highlighted there had been concerns (Response to external examiners reports – 2008-2009) with the procedures for mitigation and the associated regulations held between the two

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-05-26	a	EDU	PPR	NP report Lincoln-Notts - Doc PPCL FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

partner education providers. The external examiners had raised the concern that there were still issues regarding the operation of “mitigation panels in contradiction to moderated judgement of standards of some trainees”. The visitors noted that the programme team is satisfied no trainee has completed the programme with doubts about their competence or fitness to practise but have also noted the repeated external examiners comments around this issue that states that “progress with the mitigation issue has been made, but there is still work to be done”. The visitors were concerned with the reflections this has on programme management and the impacts these problems have on whether or not the successful graduates meet fitness to practise standards as set by the programme.

The programme has identified within the documentation that they are planning to make substantial changes to the curriculum in the second and third year of the programme; they have highlighted that the HPC may want to bring forward the planned visit to assess these changes as well as all of our standards.

The visitors were in agreement that bringing the already scheduled visit forward to assess this programme fully against all of our standards of education and training is the best way to proceed in light of the concerns raised here and the suggestion made by the education provider that the visit is brought forward.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-05-26	a	EDU	PPR	NP report Lincoln-Notts - Doc PPCL FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None