![hpc health professions council logo]

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Institute of Education, University of London
Programme name	Doctorate in Professional Educational, Child and Adolescent Psychology (DEdPsy)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Educational psychologist
Date of visit	16 – 17 June 2010

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 'Educational 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 26 August 2011. At the Committee meeting on 26 August 2010, 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. 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	Trevor Holme (Educational psychologist)
	Judith Bamford (Educational psychologist)
HPC executive officers (in attendance)	Ben Potter
Proposed student numbers	11
Initial approval	January 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2010
Chair	Sue Hallam (Institute of Education)
Secretary	Gill Hinson (Institute of Education)
Members of the joint panel	Kairen Cullen (British Psychological Society)
	Margaret Tunbridge (British Psychological Society)
	Tara Midgen (British Psychological Society)
	Rupal Nathwani (British Psychological Society)
	Laura Clarke (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	☒	☐	☐

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 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 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.

The visitors did not make any commendations on the programme.

Commendations are observations of innovative best practice by a programme or education provider.

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 relevant programme documentation, including online information, to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation submitted by the education provider contained instances of inconsistent use of terminology in relation to the statutory regulation of the programme. The visitors noted that there were some instances of the British Psychological Society (BPS) being referred to as the regulatory body for the profession (Year 1 Handbook, p18) or suggesting that meeting the BPS professional standards (Portfolio Guidelines, p17) or standards of conduct performance and ethics (Fitness to Practice Policy, p12 -13) would be sufficient to practice as an educational psychologist. Some information (Year 1 Handbook, p23; Programme Specification, p3 and p8) was unclear as to the relationship between completion of the programme and registration in that it implies that registration is automatic upon completion. HPC approval of a programme does not automatically lead to HPC registration for students who successfully complete the programme; rather it leads to 'eligibility to apply for HPC registration'.

The visitors also noted in discussion with the programme team that the documentation was being updated as a matter of course. However, the visitors considered some of the terminology and the omission of some of the requirements for HPC Registration and ability to work as an Educational psychologist could be misleading to applicants and students. The visitors therefore require the documentation and online information to be reviewed to remove any instances of inconsistent or out of date terminology to ensure that the programme continues to meet this standard.

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the relevant programme documentation, specifically the physical and online advertising material, to ensure that applicants are aware of the English language requirements of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided and in discussion with the programme team that the programme does place an English language requirement on applicants wishing to take up a place on the programme. This is set out in the Doctoral School Programme Specification (p15) and in the Programme Regulations (p2) at International English Language Testing System (IELTS) 7 or above with no score in any section lower than 7. However, the visitors stated that there was no mention of this requirement in the advertising material for the programme beyond 'effective communication both written and

oral'. The visitors felt that this may be misleading for applicants and that a more explicit reference to the IELTS requirement was necessary. The visitors therefore require evidence that applicants are made aware of the reading, writing, and spoken English requirement before deciding to take up a place on the programme to ensure this standard continues to be met.

2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the relevant programme documentation to ensure that applicants are aware of the implications of the 'Fitness to Practice Policy' applied by the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation and in discussion with the programme team that the 'Fitness to Practice Policy' of the programme requires students to disclose any significant issues pertaining to their health and subsequent ability to complete the programme. However the visitors could not find any references to the policy's requirement in the advertising material or documentation provided to applicants prior to them taking up a place on the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence that applicants are made aware of the requirements of the programme's 'Fitness to Practice Policy' to ensure that applicants are aware of the possible requirements and that the programme continues to meet this standard.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HPC registered unless alternate arrangements have been agreed with the HPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. The visitors were happy with the external examiner arrangements after discussions with the programme team. However this standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme must state that any external examiner appointed to the programme needs to be appropriately registered or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. Therefore the visitors require evidence that HPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiner to the programme have been included in the documentation, specifically in the programme regulations, to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors wish to recommend that the education provider notifies the HPC using the major change process when the academic regulations concerning the conferment of aegrotat awards are changed.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and also in conversation with the senior management team that the programme does not confer aegrotat awards. Therefore the visitors were satisfied that the SET was met. However in further discussions with the senior management team it was highlighted that the regulations regarding the awarding of aegrotat awards are to change in the future. From the information provided at the visit it appeared that the proposed change would not affect the ability to meet this standard but would like to highlight that the approval process can not approve prospective changes such as this. Therefore the visitors recommend that when the changes to the regulations occur that these changes are communicated to the HPC using the HPC's major change process.

Judith Bamford
Trevor Holme