

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Staffordshire University
Programme title	Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality	Health psychologist
Date of submission to the HCPC	9 April 2015
Name and profession of the HCPC Visitors	Gareth Roderique-Davies (Health psychologist) Tony Ward (Health psychologist)
HCPC executive	Hollie Latham

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 3 Programme management and resources
SET 4 Curriculum
SET 6 Assessment

There has been a change to programme leader. In addition to this there have been a number of curriculum changes in line with recent guidance from the professional body.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Standards of proficiency (SOPs) cross-referencing template.
- Module descriptors
- Module descriptor placement learning
- Confirmed Report Psychology (internal review Document)

- Psychology Postgraduate review document
- Curriculum vitae for Rachel Povey

Section three: Additional documentation

- ☐ The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- ☒ The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the visitors were directed to a document containing module descriptors for the programme. Within this document the visitors noted that the Teaching in Health Psychology module, page 8, states that “Normally both components need to be passed”. The above statement suggests that students may not be required to pass both components of the module, however the visitors were not able to define under which circumstances this could apply. In particular, it was noted that should a student not be required to pass the first unit of this module they would not meet learning outcomes one to four. The visitors were unable to identify where else in the curriculum these learning outcomes might be covered. The visitors noted that, should a student not be required to pass both components of the module, they cannot be sure that students who successfully complete the programme will meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for health psychologists. The visitors therefore require further information and clarity on which components will be compulsory to pass in the Teaching in Health Psychology module. Further to this, should there be instances where it is not compulsory for both components to be passed, the visitors will need to see evidence of how students will otherwise meet the learning outcomes for this module and, as such, the SOPs for health psychologists.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

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 have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- ☒ There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- ☐ There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.