

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	British Psychological Society
Name of programme(s)	Qualification in Educational Psychology (Scotland (Stage 2)), Flexible
Date submission received	14 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15405-G4M6B2

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Outcome from second review.....	6
Section 6: Visitors' recommendation.....	9

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) 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, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our 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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Sasha Hall	Practitioner psychologist - Educational psychologist
Stephen Boynes	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Qualification in Educational Psychology (Scotland (Stage 2))
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Educational psychologist
First intake	01 September 2011
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09084

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	The education provider has not submitted monitoring as, due to significant staffing changes, they have not collected data in this area.
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The education provider has not submitted monitoring as, due to significant staffing changes, they have not collected data in this area.

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: In the submission the education provider had not submitted evidence of service user and carer and practice-based learning monitoring, as part of the expanded evidence base requirement for this year. In their covering letter, they indicated that work had started on surveys to “collect feedback from candidates, supervisors and service users”. However, they also indicated that this did not progress due to significant staff changes. In addition, the visitors noted the comments that “our programme leads meet three times per year to discuss and input into all of our approved programmes”. The visitors were unclear whether these meetings included discussions about the monitoring of service user and carer involvement or practice-based learning. The covering letter also mentioned the use of an existing system to gather feedback until a new Virtual Learning Platform (VLE) is introduced in June 2020. The visitors did not receive any further information about the existing system or how this is used in the monitoring of service users and carers involvement or practice-based learning. As such, the visitors could not confirm how the education provider makes sure the programme delivers overall quality and effectiveness on an ongoing basis. The education provider must show how they are monitoring and evaluating the programme’s quality and effectiveness, particularly in relation to service user and carer involvement and practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show there are effective and regular monitoring systems in place for practice-based learning and service user and carer involvement.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In response to this standard, the education provider did not provide evidence of their policies though provided a covering letter in which they described their plans on how to involve service users and carers in the programme. They indicated that they had plans to collect service user feedback from surveys in 2018. However, due to significant staff changes, this work did not progress and the surveys were not carried out. In addition, the mapping document also referred the visitors to information about the Qualification Reference Group (QRG) in the covering letter. The visitors were unable to locate this information. The education provider did not submit any other evidence as part of the expanded evidence base around this standard to demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear how service users and carers contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme to make sure that learners completing the programme are fit to practise. The visitors therefore require further evidence around this standard.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which shows how service users and carers are involved in the programme and contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In response to this standard, the education provider did not provide evidence of their policies though provided a covering letter in which they described their plans to involve learners in the programme. The education provider indicated that learners are able to feedback at the very start of the programme and then informally during their enrolment on the programme. This standard is about how the experience of learners is

central to the quality and effectiveness of the programme. As learner feedback is not gathered throughout the programme in a formal way, it was not clear to the visitors that learners' experiences are being considered in order to improve the programme. It also did not indicate that learners are being encouraged to be involved. The education provider indicated they intend to gather testimonials to strengthen the way they meet this SET. In addition they also indicated that the new virtual learning platform (VLE) will allow them to gather and respond to feedback in a timely manner. The visitors were unable to see the frequency, nature or detail of these testimonials or how they would be used to improve the programme. As such they did not consider the standard to be met. The education provider must show how learners are involved in improving the quality and effectiveness of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how learners are involved in the programme so that their experience is central to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider highlighted sections in the Candidate Handbook and provided documentation that related to professional conduct, Postgraduate Regulations and a Probationary Audit form. The visitors noted that the indicated sections in the Candidate Handbook related to learners upholding their own professional conduct and the safety of practice-based learning for learners. These sections did not outline the mechanism in place for learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. This standard is about helping learners recognise situations where service users may be at risk, supporting them in raising concerns and making sure action is taken in response to those concerns. The education provider indicated in their narrative for this standard that the audit tool used would allow learners to raise concerns. However, they also stated this tool is to ensure the proposed learning setting will provide a safe and effective learning experience. Therefore the visitors considered this tool did not allow for learners to raise concerns during their time in practice. In addition, the mapping document made reference to a formal quarterly meeting the learners will have with their Co-ordinating Supervisors. Learners are also required to have at least monthly contact with their Co-ordinating Supervisor, where they can "raise any concerns they may have about their training". However, from this information, the visitors were unclear if this included the safety and wellbeing of service users. They were also unsure of the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which shows the effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider highlighted sections in the Candidate Handbook. In the first of these sections the visitors could see the education provider had highlighted the professions that educational psychologists would commonly collaborate with during their training. The second section highlighted that learners would be required to evidence a good piece of communication with other professionals as part of their work place evidence. The education provider did not detail

about what this piece of communication could be or what other professionals would be considered appropriate. In addition, the visitors were unclear or whether this included learners from other relevant professions. This standard is about how learners are prepared to work with other professionals and across professions for the benefit of service users and carers. The education provider must therefore provide further evidence to show that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider highlighted sections of the Candidate Handbook and the Plan of Training Form. In the ethics and professional conduct section the visitors noted that the learners were made aware of the need to abide by appropriate ethical and professional standards. In the portfolio submission section they could see that learners would need reflect on their own practice and implicitly consider professional and reflective practice. Furthermore, in the assessment criteria the education provider made reference to managing complex ethical and professional issues. While the visitors were able to see where learners would be taught about professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics, they were unable to determine how learners would demonstrate this learning. This is because none of these sections made reference to the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) did not highlight how learners would demonstrate they had met them. In addition, the Plan of Training did not mention the SCPEs nor did it explain how the assessment of learners' professional behaviour would be carried out. Therefore the education provider must provide more information around how learners are able to demonstrate they meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including how they demonstrate the SCPEs.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how learners demonstrate they meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including how they demonstrate the SCPEs.

Section 5: Outcome from second review

Recommendation of the visitors – approval visit required

The education provider responded to the request for further evidence set out in section 4. Following their consideration of this response, the visitors were not satisfied that there was sufficient evidence that the following standards continue to be met, for the reason(s) detailed below.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: In response to the additional documentation request, the education provider provided terms of reference (TOR) from their 'Stakeholder representative engagement group' and an Annual monitoring summary report from their Qualifications Committee on 11 October 2017 as evidence for this standard. From their review of the TOR, the

visitors noted that service users and learners were identified as relevant stakeholders. Some of the responsibilities of these stakeholders included working together to gather feedback relating to employment or practice-based learning, which then gets passed onto the Qualifications Committee to review. In addition, the TOR states in Section 1.5 “Provide periodic reports on activities and emerging issues to feedback to the Qualifications Committee at each of their meetings (via the Delivery Team)”. From reviewing the report from October 2017 it was stated that this committee meets three times a year which formed as part of the regular monitoring.

As outlined under Section 4 of this report, the visitors could not find any evidence demonstrating how the monitoring of service users and practice-based learning had occurred for the last two years. From reviewing the TOR, the visitors noted in responsibility 1.3 mention of using “multiple methods to seek stakeholder feedback”, however there was no further information provided about what these multiple methods might be nor how this would be facilitated. From the October 2017 report, the visitors could not see any evidence showing what discussions took place when the committee members met three times a year, to suggest any monitoring of service users or practice-based learning. The visitors did note under the “Events” section that three regional training events had occurred for supervisors. However, no further information was received which outlined if these events had also been an opportunity for feedback gathering.

The education provider clarified that going forward, the Virtual Learning Platform (VLE) which was to be introduced in June 2020 to monitor surveys and feedback, was delayed due to COVID-19 and will now be launched in September 2020. Without any further information provided, the visitors were still not clear of the system or process of analysing and evaluating feedback gathered from learners or regarding practice-based learning. As outlined under Section 4, it was still not clear how the VLE will contribute to critically reviewing current programme arrangements. Due to this, the visitors could not determine whether there was a system to respond to any identified risks or challenges noted within the programme. Based on this, the visitors could not determine if the programme has regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provider referenced terms of reference (TOR) from their ‘Stakeholder representative engagement group’, as evidence for this standard. This document identified service users as one of the stakeholders who would be worked with to “gather feedback which contributes to the overall quality, effectiveness and development of the Society’s qualifications”. In the response letter provided, the education provider clarified that this was a change to how they demonstrated service users and carers’ involvement in the programme going forward.

From reviewing the evidence, the visitors noted that the TOR are generic. It was not made explicitly clear whether this document applies to any specific programme or is a generic document applied across all the programmes offered by the education provider. It was not clear to the visitors which of the mentioned eleven roles and responsibilities outlined in the TOR applied to service users and carers. For example, responsibility 1.1 states “To work with stakeholders, including service users and candidates (learners), to gather feedback which contributes to the overall, effectiveness and development of the

Society's qualifications". This clearly identifies service users and carers, though not how this will occur. Another example is responsibility 1.10 which states "To nominate Society division representatives, as appropriate, to join the meetings". The visitors were unclear if or how service users and carers could be involved in this. It was therefore not clear during which aspects of the programme their involvement will take place. Based on this, the visitors could not determine where and how service user and carer involvement will take place appropriate to the programme.

From further clarification regarding the additional evidence, the education provider stated that service user and carer involvement will be monitored by the Professional Development Delivery Team (PDDT), who will provide the link between the Stakeholder representative engagement group and Qualifications Committee, including administration with the necessary support. Without any further information provided, it was not clear what PDDT processes are in place to plan, monitor and evaluate service user and carer involvement in the programme. Based on these findings, the visitors could not determine how service user and carers will be involved in the programme and how will their contribution add to overall quality and effectiveness of the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provider referenced terms of reference (TOR) from their 'Stakeholder representative engagement group and a learner survey as evidence for this standard. The TOR mentioned about learners working with other stakeholders such as service user and carers, to gather feedback which would then be passed onto the Qualifications Committee for review. From a review of the documents, the visitors noted that only pages 5 to 7 of the survey had questions that related to learners' experience of the programme and the education provider. From further clarification regarding how the learner survey is collected and utilised, the education provider stated "Currently the survey results are recorded on Questback and the Professional Development Delivery Team are responsible for collecting and sharing the feedback with the Qualifications Boards who are jointly responsible for monitoring the results and reporting any trends, and actions required to the Qualifications Committee".

From reviewing the evidence provided, the visitors could not find any information suggesting how learners are involved in the programme other than filling out the survey. It was not clear to the visitors which of the mentioned eleven roles and responsibilities outlined in the TOR applied to learners. For example, responsibility 1.1 states "To work with stakeholders, including service users and candidates (learners), to gather feedback which contributes to the overall, effectiveness and development of the Society's qualifications". This clearly identifies learners, though not how this will occur. Another example is responsibility 1.6 which states "To consider feedback and recommendations from stakeholders, and to support qualification boards and divisions to make improvements, harmonise processes and procedures wherever feasible." The visitors were unclear if or how learners were involved in these areas.

Additionally, based on clarification provided by the education provider explaining how feedback is collected by the Qualifications Boards, it was not clear how this gets utilised and is worked upon. Based on this, the visitors could not determine whether feedback gathered is used in a meaningful way to develop or improve the programme. As the VLE is a work in progress, to be launched in September 2020, no further information

was provided regarding how learners will be made aware of the actions taken as a result of the survey and feedback gathered. Due to these findings, the visitors could not determine how learners' involvement in the programme will contribute to the overall effectiveness of the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: The education provider evidenced a document titled, 'Enrolment form' for this standard. From reviewing this document, the visitors noted this was a risk assessment form that had been filled out by the learner and co-ordinating supervisor at the practice-based learning setting. Page one of the form referred to "guidance and notes for completing this form", however there were no guidance notes provided.

The visitors also noted page nine of the form included questions as part of a checklist covering various scenarios regarding trainees, co-ordinating supervisors within the line management relationship at the practice-based learning site. As part of this, a question was outlined to confirm whether there is a process to support learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. This was a tick box response and no further information was provided, within the form or the wider submission, regarding how learners are enabled or made aware of the process, nor what the process is.

The visitors recognised that this form constituted a risk assessment form that had to be completed as part of learners' induction at practice-based learning. The visitors understood that the co-ordinating supervisor is responsible for ensuring that learners understand the different policies and processes that learners will need to be aware of and comply with, at the practice-based learning setting. However, by seeing just a list of policy names without any content provided, the visitors could not determine if these policies ensured learners are able to recognise a situation where service users may be at risk. It was also not possible to determine how learners are supported in raising any concerns, or how they are made to understand their responsibilities regarding this when they believe the safety or wellbeing of service users is at risk. The evidence also did not address how concerns raised by learners will be considered and acted on. Therefore, the visitors could not find any evidence which shows the effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Section 6: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met for the reason(s) noted in section 5, and recommend that an approval visit is undertaken to consider the approval of the programme(s).

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	British Psychological Society
Name of programme(s)	Qualification in Counselling Psychology, Flexible
Date submission received	14 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15406-N4B7G0

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Outcome from second review	6
Section 6: Visitors' recommendation.....	9

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) 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, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our 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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Matthew Catterall	Paramedic
Jane Lawrence	Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Qualification in Counselling Psychology
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Counselling psychologist
First intake	01 January 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 100
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09085

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	The education provider has not submitted monitoring as, due to significant staff changes, they have not collected data in this area.
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The education provider has not submitted monitoring as, due to significant staff changes, they have not collected data in this area.

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: In their submission, the education provider had not submitted evidence of both service user and carer involvement, and practice-based learning monitoring, which is

part of the expanded evidence base requirement for this year's audit. In their covering letter, they indicated that work had started on surveys to "collect feedback from candidates, supervisors and service users". However, they also indicated that this had not progressed due to significant staff changes. In addition, the visitors noted the comments that "our programme leads meet three times per year to discuss and input into all of our approved programmes". The visitors were unclear whether these meetings included discussions about the monitoring of service user and carer involvement and/or practice-based learning. The covering letter also mentioned the use of an existing system to gather feedback until a new Virtual Learning Platform (VLE) is introduced in June 2020. The visitors did not receive any further information about the existing system or how this is used in the monitoring of service users and carers involvement or practice-based learning. As such, the visitors could not confirm how the education provider makes sure the programme delivers overall quality and effectiveness on an ongoing basis to meet this standard. The education provider must show how they are monitoring and evaluating the programme's quality and effectiveness, particularly in relation to service user and carer involvement and practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show there are effective and regular monitoring systems in place for practice-based learning and service user and carer involvement.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In response to this standard, the education provider did not provide evidence of their policies, though provided a covering letter in which they described their plans on how to involve service users and carers in the programme. They indicated that they had plans to collect service user feedback from surveys in 2018. However, due to significant staff changes, this work did not progress, and the surveys were not carried out. In addition, the mapping document also referred the visitors to information about the Qualification Reference Group (QRG) in the covering letter. The visitors were unable to locate this information. The education provider did not submit any other evidence as part of the expanded evidence base around this standard to demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear how service users and carers contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme to make sure that learners completing the programme are fit to practise. The visitors therefore require further evidence around this standard.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which shows how service users and carers are involved in the programme and contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In response to this standard, the education provider did not provide evidence of their policies, though provided a covering letter in which they described their plans to involve learners in the programme. The education provider indicated that learners can feedback at the very start of the programme and then informally during their enrolment on the programme. This standard is about how the experience of learners is central to the quality and effectiveness of the programme. As learner feedback is not gathered throughout the programme in a formal way, it was not clear to the visitors that learners' experiences are being considered in order to improve the programme. It also did not indicate that learners are being encouraged to be involved. The education provider indicated they intend to gather testimonials to strengthen the way they meet this SET. In

addition, they also indicated that the new virtual learning platform (VLE) will allow them to gather and respond to feedback in a timely manner. The visitors were unable to see the frequency, nature or detail of these testimonials or how they would be used to improve the programme. As such they did not consider the standard to be met. The education provider must show how learners are involved in improving the quality and effectiveness of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how learners are involved in the programme so that their experience is central to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider highlighted sections in the Candidate Handbook and provided documentation that related to professional conduct, Postgraduate Regulations and a Probationary Audit form. The visitors noted that the indicated sections in the Candidate Handbook related to learners upholding their own professional conduct and the safety of practice-based learning for learners. These sections did not outline the mechanism in place for learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. This standard is about helping learners recognise situations where service users may be at risk, supporting them in raising concerns and making sure action is taken in response to those concerns. The education provider indicated in their narrative for this standard that the audit tool used would allow learners to raise concerns. However, they also stated this tool is to ensure the proposed learning setting will provide a safe and effective learning experience. Therefore, the visitors considered this tool did not allow for learners to raise concerns during their time in practice. In addition, the mapping document referred to a formal quarterly meeting the learners will have with their Co-ordinating Supervisors. Learners are also required to have at least monthly contact with their Co-ordinating Supervisor, where they can “raise any concerns they may have about their training”. However, from this information, the visitors were unclear if this included the safety and wellbeing of service users. They were also unsure of the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which shows the effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider highlighted sections in the Candidate Handbook. In the first of these sections the visitors could see the education had highlighted the professions that counselling psychologists would commonly collaborate with during their training. The second section highlighted that learners’ practice supervisors may not be counselling psychologists and could be professionals in other therapy disciplines. However, this was down to individual learners’ choices and this opportunity would be provided for all learners. They also highlighted a competency that learners would have to show awareness of maintaining external consultation with experienced members of this and related professions. The visitors were therefore satisfied that learners would be able to learn with, and from, professionals in other relevant professions. On page 37 of the Candidate Handbook, the visitors noted the

competences learners would have to meet around communication, influencing, teaching and leadership skills. In this section, the visitors noted that learners would be required to demonstrate how they “communicate effectively....to a variety of different audiences”, “...fostering collaborative working practices within teams” and “...influencing the psychological mindedness of teams and organisations.” From these competences, the visitors were unclear if this would mean that learners would be able to learn with, and from, other learners in relevant professions. The education provider must therefore provide further evidence to show how learners are able to learn with, and from, learners in other relevant professions.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how learners are able to learn with, and from, learners in other relevant professions.

6.4 Assessment policies must clearly specify requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: In the SETs mapping document, the education provider indicated they had made changes to their assessment strategy. The new strategy would require learners to assign specific competencies to modules in which they felt they had demonstrated them. This would be recorded in a Unit Cover Sheet. It was not clear to the visitors that all the competencies would need to be met or how learners would meet all the competencies. Following completion of the Unit Cover Sheet, the assessors verify the competencies that the learner has indicated. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation which competencies would need to be completed at each stage of the programme in order for learners to demonstrate they could progress. The visitors were therefore also unclear about what might prevent a learner from progressing from one stage of the programme to another. The education provider must detail what learners need to demonstrate to progress through the programme and what might prevent them from progressing.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which shows how learners are made aware of the requirements for progression, and what might prevent them from progressing, within the new assessment strategy.

Section 5: Outcome from second review

Recommendation of the visitors – approval visit required

The education provider responded to the request for further evidence set out in section 4. Following their consideration of this response, the visitors were not satisfied that there was sufficient evidence that the following standards continue to be met, for the reason(s) detailed below.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: In response to the additional documentation request, the education provider provided terms of reference (TOR) from their ‘Stakeholder representative engagement group’ and an Annual monitoring summary report from their Qualifications Committee on 11 October 2017 as evidence for this standard. From their review of the TOR, the visitors noted that service users and learners were identified as relevant stakeholders. Some of the responsibilities of these stakeholders included working together to gather

feedback relating to employment or practice-based learning, which then gets passed onto the Qualifications Committee to review. In addition, the TOR states in Section 1.5 “Provide periodic reports on activities and emerging issues to feedback to the Qualifications Committee at each of their meetings (via the Delivery Team)”. From reviewing the report from October 2017 it was stated that this committee meets three times a year which formed as part of the regular monitoring.

As outlined under Section 4 of this report, the visitors could not find any evidence demonstrating how the monitoring of service users and practice-based learning had occurred for the last two years. From reviewing the TOR, the visitors noted in responsibility 1.3 mention of using “multiple methods to seek stakeholder feedback”, however there was no further information provided about what these multiple methods might be nor how this would be facilitated. From the October 2017 report, the visitors could not see any evidence showing what discussions took place when the committee members met three times a year, to suggest any monitoring of service users or practice-based learning. The visitors did note under the “Events” section that three regional training events had occurred for supervisors. However, no further information was received which outlined if these events had also been an opportunity for feedback gathering.

The education provider clarified that going forward, the Virtual Learning Platform (VLE) which was to be introduced in June 2020 to monitor surveys and feedback, was delayed due to COVID-19 and will now be launched in September 2020. Without any further information provided, the visitors were still not clear of the system or process of analysing and evaluating feedback gathered from learners or regarding practice-based learning. As outlined under Section 4, it was still not clear how the VLE will contribute to critically reviewing current programme arrangements. Due to this, the visitors could not determine whether there was a system to respond to any identified risks or challenges noted within the programme. Based on this, the visitors could not determine if the programme has regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provider referenced terms of reference (TOR) from their ‘Stakeholder representative engagement group’, as evidence for this standard. This document identified service users as one of the stakeholders who would be worked with to “gather feedback which contributes to the overall quality, effectiveness and development of the Society’s qualifications”. In the response letter provided, the education provider clarified that this was a change to how they demonstrated service users and carers’ involvement in the programme going forward.

From reviewing the evidence, the visitors noted that the TOR are generic. It was not made explicitly clear whether this document applies to any specific programme or is a generic document applied across all the programmes offered by the education provider. It was not clear to the visitors which of the mentioned eleven roles and responsibilities outlined in the TOR applied to service users and carers. For example, responsibility 1.1 states “To work with stakeholders, including service users and candidates (learners), to gather feedback which contributes to the overall, effectiveness and development of the Society’s qualifications”. This clearly identifies service users and carers, though not how this will occur. Another example is responsibility 1.10 which states “To nominate Society

division representatives, as appropriate, to join the meetings”. The visitors were unclear if or how service users and carers could be involved in this. It was therefore not clear during which aspects of the programme their involvement will take place. Based on this, the visitors could not determine where and how service user and carer involvement will take place appropriate to the programme.

From further clarification regarding the additional evidence, the education provider stated that service user and carer involvement will be monitored by the Professional Development Delivery Team (PDDT), who will provide the link between the Stakeholder representative engagement group and Qualifications Committee, including administration with the necessary support. Without any further information provided, it was not clear what PDDT processes are in place to plan, monitor and evaluate service user and carer involvement in the programme. Based on these findings, the visitors could not determine how service user and carers will be involved in the programme and how will their contribution add to overall quality and effectiveness of the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provider referenced terms of reference (TOR) from their ‘Stakeholder representative engagement group and a learner survey as evidence for this standard. The TOR mentioned about learners working with other stakeholders such as service user and carers, to gather feedback which would then be passed onto the Qualifications Committee for review. From a review of the documents, the visitors noted that only pages 5 to 7 of the survey had questions that related to learners’ experience of the programme and the education provider. From further clarification regarding how the learner survey is collected and utilised, the education provider stated “Currently the survey results are recorded on Questback and the Professional Development Delivery Team are responsible for collecting and sharing the feedback with the Qualifications Boards who are jointly responsible for monitoring the results and reporting any trends, and actions required to the Qualifications Committee”.

From reviewing the evidence provided, the visitors could not find any information suggesting how learners are involved in the programme other than filling out the survey. It was not clear to the visitors which of the mentioned eleven roles and responsibilities outlined in the TOR applied to learners. For example, responsibility 1.1 states “To work with stakeholders, including service users and candidates (learners), to gather feedback which contributes to the overall, effectiveness and development of the Society’s qualifications”. This clearly identifies learners, though not how this will occur. Another example is responsibility 1.6 which states “To consider feedback and recommendations from stakeholders, and to support qualification boards and divisions to make improvements, harmonise processes and procedures wherever feasible.” The visitors were unclear if or how learners were involved in these areas.

Additionally, based on clarification provided by the education provider explaining how feedback is collected by the Qualifications Boards, it was not clear how this gets utilised and is worked upon. Based on this, the visitors could not determine whether feedback gathered is used in a meaningful way to develop or improve the programme. As the VLE is a work in progress, to be launched in September 2020, no further information was provided regarding how learners will be made aware of the actions taken as a result of the survey and feedback gathered. Due to these findings, the visitors could not

determine how learners' involvement in the programme will contribute to the overall effectiveness of the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: The education provider evidenced a document titled, 'Enrolment form' for this standard. From reviewing this document, the visitors noted this was a risk assessment form that had been filled out by the learner and co-ordinating supervisor at the practice-based learning setting. Page one of the form referred to "guidance and notes for completing this form", however there were no guidance notes provided.

The visitors also noted page nine of the form included questions as part of a checklist covering various scenarios regarding trainees, co-ordinating supervisors within the line management relationship at the practice-based learning site. As part of this, a question was outlined to confirm whether there is a process to support learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. This was a tick box response and no further information was provided, within the form or the wider submission, regarding how learners are enabled or made aware of the process, nor what the process is

The visitors recognised that this form constituted a risk assessment form that had to be completed as part of learners' induction at practice-based learning. The visitors understood that the co-ordinating supervisor is responsible for ensuring that learners understand the different policies and processes that learners will need to be aware of and comply with, at the practice-based learning setting. However, by seeing just a list of policy names without any content provided, the visitors could not determine if these policies ensured learners are able to recognise a situation where service users may be at risk. It was also not possible to determine how learners are supported in raising any concerns, or how they are made to understand their responsibilities regarding this when they believe the safety or wellbeing of service users is at risk. The evidence also did not address how concerns raised by learners will be considered and acted on. Therefore, the visitors could not find any evidence which shows the effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Section 6: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met for the reason(s) noted in section 5, and recommend that an approval visit is undertaken to consider the approval of the programme(s).

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	British Psychological Society
Name of programme(s)	Qualification in Health Psychology (Stage 2), Flexible
Date submission received	14 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15407-M6B3Z5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Visitors’ recommendation.....	3
Section 5: Outcome from second review	5
Section 6: Visitors’ recommendation.....	8

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) 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, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our 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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Antony Ward	Practitioner psychologist - Health psychologist
Paul Bates	Paramedic
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Qualification in Health Psychology (Stage 2)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Health psychologist
First intake	01 January 2001
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09086

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	The education provider has not submitted monitoring as, due to significant staffing changes, they have not collected data in this area.
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The education provider has not submitted monitoring as, due to significant staffing changes, they have not collected data in this area.

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 02 July 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: In the submission the education provider had not submitted evidence of service user and carer and practice-based learning monitoring, as part of the expanded evidence base requirement for this year. In their covering letter, they indicated that work had started on surveys to "collect feedback from candidates, supervisors and service users". However, they also indicated that this did not progress due to significant staff

changes. In addition, the visitors noted the comments that “our programme leads meet three times per year to discuss and input into all of our approved programmes”. The visitors were unclear whether these meetings included discussions about the monitoring of service user and carer involvement or practice-based learning. The covering letter also mentioned the use of an existing system to gather feedback until a new Virtual Learning Platform (VLE) is introduced in June 2020. The visitors did not receive any further information about the existing system or how this is used in the monitoring of service users and carers involvement or practice-based learning. As such, the visitors could not confirm how the education provider makes sure the programme delivers overall quality and effectiveness on an ongoing basis. The education provider must show how they are monitoring and evaluating the programme’s quality and effectiveness, particularly in relation to service user and carer involvement and practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show there are effective and regular monitoring systems in place for practice-based learning and service user and carer involvement.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In response to this standard, the education provider did not provide evidence of their policies though provided a covering letter in which they described their plans on how to involve service users and carers in the programme. They indicated that they had plans to collect service user feedback from surveys in 2018. However, due to significant staff changes, this work did not progress and the surveys were not carried out. In addition, the mapping document also referred the visitors to information about the Qualification Reference Group (QRG) in the covering letter. The visitors were unable to locate this information. The education provider did not submit any other evidence as part of the expanded evidence base around this standard to demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear how service users and carers contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme to make sure that learners completing the programme are fit to practise. The visitors therefore require further evidence around this standard.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which shows how service users and carers are involved in the programme and contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In response to this standard, the education provider did not provide evidence of their policies though provided a covering letter in which they described their plans to involve learners in the programme. The education provider indicated that learners are able to feedback at the very start of the programme and then informally during their enrolment on the programme. This standard is about how the experience of learners is central to the quality and effectiveness of the programme. As learner feedback is not gathered throughout the programme in a formal way, it was not clear to the visitors that learners’ experiences are being considered in order to improve the programme. It also did not indicate that learners are being encouraged to be involved. The education provider indicated they intend to gather testimonials to strengthen the way they meet this SET. In addition they also indicated that the new virtual learning platform (VLE) will allow them to gather and respond to feedback in a timely manner. The visitors were unable to see the frequency, nature or detail of these testimonials or how they would be

used to improve the programme. As such they did not consider the standard to be met. The education provider must show how learners are involved in improving the quality and effectiveness of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how learners are involved in the programme so that their experience is central to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider highlighted sections in the Candidate Handbook and the Enrolment Form (placement audit). The visitors noted that the indicated sections in the Candidate Handbook related to learners upholding their own professional conduct and the safety of practice-based learning for learners. These sections did not outline the mechanism in place for learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. This standard is about helping learners recognise situations where service users may be at risk, supporting them in raising concerns and making sure action is taken in response to those concerns. The education provider indicated that the audit tool used would allow learners to raise concerns. However, they also stated this tool is to ensure the proposed learning setting will provide a safe and effective learning experience. Therefore the visitors considered this tool did not allow for learners to raise concerns during their time in practice. In addition, the Candidate Handbook made reference to a formal quarterly meeting the learners will have with their Co-ordinating Supervisors. However, from this information, the visitors were unclear if this included an opportunity for learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. They were therefore unsure of the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which shows the effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Section 5: Outcome from second review

Recommendation of the visitors – approval visit required

The education provider responded to the request for further evidence set out in section 4. Following their consideration of this response, the visitors were not satisfied that there was sufficient evidence that the following standards continue to be met, for the reason(s) detailed below.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: In response to the additional documentation request, the education provider provided terms of reference (TOR) from their 'Stakeholder representative engagement group' and an Annual monitoring summary report from their Qualifications Committee on 11 October 2017 as evidence for this standard. From their review of the TOR, the visitors noted that service users and learners were identified as relevant stakeholders. Some of the responsibilities of these stakeholders included working together to gather feedback relating to employment or practice-based learning, which then gets passed

onto the Qualifications Committee to review. In addition, the TOR states in Section 1.5 “Provide periodic reports on activities and emerging issues to feedback to the Qualifications Committee at each of their meetings (via the Delivery Team)”. From reviewing the report from October 2017 it was stated that this committee meets three times a year which formed as part of the regular monitoring.

As outlined under Section 4 of this report, the visitors could not find any evidence demonstrating how the monitoring of service users and practice-based learning had occurred for the last two years. From reviewing the TOR, the visitors noted in responsibility 1.3 mention of using “multiple methods to seek stakeholder feedback”, however there was no further information provided about what these multiple methods might be nor how this would be facilitated. From the October 2017 report, the visitors could not see any evidence showing what discussions took place when the committee members met three times a year, to suggest any monitoring of service users or practice-based learning. The visitors did note under the “Events” section that three regional training events had occurred for supervisors. However, no further information was received which outlined if these events had also been an opportunity for feedback gathering.

The education provider clarified that going forward, the Virtual Learning Platform (VLE) which was to be introduced in June 2020 to monitor surveys and feedback, was delayed due to COVID-19 and will now be launched in September 2020. Without any further information provided, the visitors were still not clear of the system or process of analysing and evaluating feedback gathered from learners or regarding practice-based learning. As outlined under Section 4, it was still not clear how the VLE will contribute to critically reviewing current programme arrangements. Due to this, the visitors could not determine whether there was a system to respond to any identified risks or challenges noted within the programme. Based on this, the visitors could not determine if the programme has regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provider referenced terms of reference (TOR) from their ‘Stakeholder representative engagement group’, as evidence for this standard. This document identified service users as one of the stakeholders who would be worked with to “gather feedback which contributes to the overall quality, effectiveness and development of the Society’s qualifications”. In the response letter provided, the education provider clarified that this was a change to how they demonstrated service users and carers’ involvement in the programme going forward.

From reviewing the evidence, the visitors noted that the TOR are generic. It was not made explicitly clear whether this document applies to any specific programme or is a generic document applied across all the programmes offered by the education provider. It was not clear to the visitors which of the mentioned eleven roles and responsibilities outlined in the TOR applied to service users and carers. For example, responsibility 1.1 states “To work with stakeholders, including service users and candidates (learners), to gather feedback which contributes to the overall, effectiveness and development of the Society’s qualifications”. This clearly identifies service users and carers, though not how this will occur. Another example is responsibility 1.10 which states “To nominate Society division representatives, as appropriate, to join the meetings”. The visitors were unclear

if or how service users and carers could be involved in this. It was therefore not clear during which aspects of the programme their involvement will take place. Based on this, the visitors could not determine where and how service user and carer involvement will take place appropriate to the programme.

From further clarification regarding the additional evidence, the education provider stated that service user and carer involvement will be monitored by the Professional Development Delivery Team (PDDT), who will provide the link between the Stakeholder representative engagement group and Qualifications Committee, including administration with the necessary support. Without any further information provided, it was not clear what PDDT processes are in place to plan, monitor and evaluate service user and carer involvement in the programme. Based on these findings, the visitors could not determine how service user and carers will be involved in the programme and how will their contribution add to overall quality and effectiveness of the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provider referenced terms of reference (TOR) from their 'Stakeholder representative engagement group and a learner survey as evidence for this standard. The TOR mentioned about learners working with other stakeholders such as service user and carers, to gather feedback which would then be passed onto the Qualifications Committee for review. From a review of the documents, the visitors noted that only pages 5 to 7 of the survey had questions that related to learners' experience of the programme and the education provider. From further clarification regarding how the learner survey is collected and utilised, the education provider stated "Currently the survey results are recorded on Questback and the Professional Development Delivery Team are responsible for collecting and sharing the feedback with the Qualifications Boards who are jointly responsible for monitoring the results and reporting any trends, and actions required to the Qualifications Committee".

From reviewing the evidence provided, the visitors could not find any information suggesting how learners are involved in the programme other than filling out the survey. It was not clear to the visitors which of the mentioned eleven roles and responsibilities outlined in the TOR applied to learners. For example, responsibility 1.1 states "To work with stakeholders, including service users and candidates (learners), to gather feedback which contributes to the overall, effectiveness and development of the Society's qualifications". This clearly identifies learners, though not how this will occur. Another example is responsibility 1.6 which states "To consider feedback and recommendations from stakeholders, and to support qualification boards and divisions to make improvements, harmonise processes and procedures wherever feasible." The visitors were unclear if or how learners were involved in these areas.

Additionally, based on clarification provided by the education provider explaining how feedback is collected by the Qualifications Boards, it was not clear how this gets utilised and is worked upon. Based on this, the visitors could not determine whether feedback gathered is used in a meaningful way to develop or improve the programme. As the VLE is a work in progress, to be launched in September 2020, no further information was provided regarding how learners will be made aware of the actions taken as a result of the survey and feedback gathered. Due to these findings, the visitors could not determine how learners' involvement in the programme will contribute to the overall

effectiveness of the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: The education provider evidenced a document titled, 'Enrolment form' for this standard. From reviewing this document, the visitors noted this was a risk assessment form that had been filled out by the learner and co-ordinating supervisor at the practice-based learning setting. Page one of the form referred to "guidance and notes for completing this form", however there were no guidance notes provided.

The visitors also noted page nine of the form included questions as part of a checklist covering various scenarios regarding trainees, co-ordinating supervisors within the line management relationship at the practice-based learning site. As part of this, a question was outlined to confirm whether there is a process to support learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. This was a tick box response and no further information was provided, within the form or the wider submission, regarding how learners are enabled or made aware of the process, nor what the process is.

The visitors recognised that this form constituted a risk assessment form that had to be completed as part of learners' induction at practice-based learning. The visitors understood that the co-ordinating supervisor is responsible for ensuring that learners understand the different policies and processes that learners will need to be aware of and comply with, at the practice-based learning setting. However, by seeing just a list of policy names without any content provided, the visitors could not determine if these policies ensured learners are able to recognise a situation where service users may be at risk. It was also not possible to determine how learners are supported in raising any concerns, or how they are made to understand their responsibilities regarding this when they believe the safety or wellbeing of service users is at risk. The evidence also did not address how concerns raised by learners will be considered and acted on. Therefore, the visitors could not find any evidence which shows the effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Section 6: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met for the reason(s) noted in section 5, and recommend that an approval visit is undertaken to consider the approval of the programme(s).

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	British Psychological Society
Name of programme(s)	Qualification in Sport and Exercise Psychology (Stage 2), Flexible
Date submission received	14 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15413-V0V5W9

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review	3
Section 5: Outcome from second review	5
Section 6: Visitors’ recommendation.....	8

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) 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, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our 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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Sandra Wolfson	Practitioner psychologist Sport and exercise psychologist
Stephen Smith	Practitioner psychologist Occupational psychologist, Sport and exercise psychologist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Qualification in Sport and Exercise Psychology (Stage 2)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Sport and exercise psychologist
First intake	01 January 2008
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 75
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09088

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	The education provider has not submitted monitoring as, due to significant staff changes, they have not collected data in this area.
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The education provider has not submitted monitoring as, due to significant staff changes, they have not collected data in this area.

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: In the submission the education provider had not submitted evidence of service user and carer and practice-based learning monitoring, as part of the expanded evidence base requirement for this year. In their covering letter, they indicated that work had started on surveys to “collect feedback from candidates, supervisors and service users”. However, they also indicated that this did not progress due to significant staff changes. In addition, the visitors noted the comments that “our programme leads meet three times per year to discuss and input into all of our approved programmes”. The visitors were unclear whether these meetings included discussions about the monitoring of service user and carer involvement or practice-based learning. The covering letter also mentioned the use of an existing system to gather feedback until a new Virtual Learning Platform (VLE) is introduced in June 2020. The visitors did not receive any further information about the existing system or how this is used in the monitoring of service users and carers involvement or practice-based learning. As such, the visitors could not confirm how the education provider makes sure the programme delivers overall quality and effectiveness on an ongoing basis. The education provider must show how they are monitoring and evaluating the programme’s quality and effectiveness, particularly in relation to service user and carer involvement and practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show there are effective and regular monitoring systems in place for practice-based learning and service user and carer involvement.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In response to this standard, the education provider did not provide evidence of their policies though provided a covering letter in which they described their plans on how to involve service users and carers in the programme. They indicated that they had plans to collect service user feedback from surveys in 2018. However, due to significant staff changes, this work did not progress and the surveys were not carried out. In addition, the mapping document also referred the visitors to information about the Qualification Reference Group (QRG) in the covering letter. The visitors were unable to locate this information. The education provider did not submit any other evidence as part of the expanded evidence base around this standard to demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear how service users and carers contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme to make sure that learners completing the programme are fit to practise. The visitors therefore require further evidence around this standard.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which shows how service users and carers are involved in the programme and contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In response to this standard, the education provider did not provide evidence of their policies though provided a covering letter in which they described their plans to involve learners in the programme. The education provider indicated that learners are able to feedback at the very start of the programme and then informally during their enrolment on the programme. This standard is about how the experience of learners is

central to the quality and effectiveness of the programme. As learner feedback is not gathered throughout the programme in a formal way, it was not clear to the visitors that learners' experiences are being considered in order to improve the programme. It also did not indicate that learners are being encouraged to be involved. The education provider indicated they intend to gather testimonials to strengthen the way they meet this SET. In addition they also indicated that the new virtual learning platform (VLE) will allow them to gather and respond to feedback in a timely manner. The visitors were unable to see the frequency, nature or detail of these testimonials or how they would be used to improve the programme. As such they did not consider the standard to be met. The education provider must show how learners are involved in improving the quality and effectiveness of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how learners are involved in the programme so that their experience is central to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider highlighted sections in the Candidate Handbook, Regulations for the Society's Postgraduate Qualifications and the Enrolment form. The visitors noted that the indicated sections related to learners upholding their own professional conduct and the safety of practice-based learning for learners. These sections did not outline the mechanism in place for learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. This standard is about helping learners recognise situations where service users may be at risk, supporting them in raising concerns and making sure action is taken in response to those concerns. The mapping document made reference to a formal quarterly meeting the learners will have with their Co-ordinating Supervisors. In addition, within the Candidate Handbook, the visitors noted that the Co-ordinating Supervisor would "listen to your views and concerns regarding your work in progress and offer appropriate advice". However, from this information, the visitors were unclear if this included discussions about the safety and wellbeing of service users. They were also unsure of the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which shows the effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Section 5: Outcome from second review

Recommendation of the visitors – approval visit required

The education provider responded to the request for further evidence set out in section 4. Following their consideration of this response, the visitors were not satisfied that there was sufficient evidence that the following standards continue to be met, for the reason(s) detailed below.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: In response to the additional documentation request, the education provider provided terms of reference (TOR) from their 'Stakeholder representative engagement group' and an Annual monitoring summary report from their Qualifications Committee on 11 October 2017 as evidence for this standard. From their review of the TOR, the visitors noted that service users and learners were identified as relevant stakeholders. Some of the responsibilities of these stakeholders included working together to gather feedback relating to employment or practice-based learning, which then gets passed onto the Qualifications Committee to review. In addition, the TOR states in Section 1.5 "Provide periodic reports on activities and emerging issues to feedback to the Qualifications Committee at each of their meetings (via the Delivery Team)". From reviewing the report from October 2017 it was stated that this committee meets three times a year which formed as part of the regular monitoring.

As outlined under Section 4 of this report, the visitors could not find any evidence demonstrating how the monitoring of service users and practice-based learning had occurred for the last two years. From reviewing the TOR, the visitors noted in responsibility 1.3 mention of using "multiple methods to seek stakeholder feedback", however there was no further information provided about what these multiple methods might be nor how this would be facilitated. From the October 2017 report, the visitors could not see any evidence showing what discussions took place when the committee members met three times a year, to suggest any monitoring of service users or practice-based learning. The visitors did note under the "Events" section that three regional training events had occurred for supervisors. However, no further information was received which outlined if these events had also been an opportunity for feedback gathering.

The education provider clarified that going forward, the Virtual Learning Platform (VLE) which was to be introduced in June 2020 to monitor surveys and feedback, was delayed due to COVID-19 and will now be launched in September 2020. Without any further information provided, the visitors were still not clear of the system or process of analysing and evaluating feedback gathered from learners or regarding practice-based learning. As outlined under Section 4, it was still not clear how the VLE will contribute to critically reviewing current programme arrangements. Due to this, the visitors could not determine whether there was a system to respond to any identified risks or challenges noted within the programme. Based on this, the visitors could not determine if the programme has regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provider referenced terms of reference (TOR) from their 'Stakeholder representative engagement group', as evidence for this standard. This document identified service users as one of the stakeholders who would be worked with to "gather feedback which contributes to the overall quality, effectiveness and development of the Society's qualifications". In the response letter provided, the education provider clarified that this was a change to how they demonstrated service users and carers' involvement in the programme going forward.

From reviewing the evidence, the visitors noted that the TOR are generic. It was not made explicitly clear whether this document applies to any specific programme or is a generic document applied across all the programmes offered by the education provider.

It was not clear to the visitors which of the mentioned eleven roles and responsibilities outlined in the TOR applied to service users and carers. For example, responsibility 1.1 states “To work with stakeholders, including service users and candidates (learners), to gather feedback which contributes to the overall, effectiveness and development of the Society’s qualifications”. This clearly identifies service users and carers, though not how this will occur. Another example is responsibility 1.10 which states “To nominate Society division representatives, as appropriate, to join the meetings”. The visitors were unclear if or how service users and carers could be involved in this. It was therefore not clear during which aspects of the programme their involvement will take place. Based on this, the visitors could not determine where and how service user and carer involvement will take place appropriate to the programme.

From further clarification regarding the additional evidence, the education provider stated that service user and carer involvement will be monitored by the Professional Development Delivery Team (PDDT), who will provide the link between the Stakeholder representative engagement group and Qualifications Committee, including administration with the necessary support. Without any further information provided, it was not clear what PDDT processes are in place to plan, monitor and evaluate service user and carer involvement in the programme. Based on these findings, the visitors could not determine how service user and carers will be involved in the programme and how will their contribution add to overall quality and effectiveness of the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provider referenced terms of reference (TOR) from their ‘Stakeholder representative engagement group and a learner survey as evidence for this standard. The TOR mentioned about learners working with other stakeholders such as service user and carers, to gather feedback which would then be passed onto the Qualifications Committee for review. From a review of the documents, the visitors noted that only pages 5 to 7 of the survey had questions that related to learners’ experience of the programme and the education provider. From further clarification regarding how the learner survey is collected and utilised, the education provider stated “Currently the survey results are recorded on Questback and the Professional Development Delivery Team are responsible for collecting and sharing the feedback with the Qualifications Boards who are jointly responsible for monitoring the results and reporting any trends, and actions required to the Qualifications Committee”.

From reviewing the evidence provided, the visitors could not find any information suggesting how learners are involved in the programme other than filling out the survey. It was not clear to the visitors which of the mentioned eleven roles and responsibilities outlined in the TOR applied to learners. For example, responsibility 1.1 states “To work with stakeholders, including service users and candidates (learners), to gather feedback which contributes to the overall, effectiveness and development of the Society’s qualifications”. This clearly identifies learners, though not how this will occur. Another example is responsibility 1.6 which states “To consider feedback and recommendations from stakeholders, and to support qualification boards and divisions to make improvements, harmonise processes and procedures wherever feasible.” The visitors were unclear if or how learners were involved in these areas.

Additionally, based on clarification provided by the education provider explaining how feedback is collected by the Qualifications Boards, it was not clear how this gets utilised and is worked upon. Based on this, the visitors could not determine whether feedback gathered is used in a meaningful way to develop or improve the programme. As the VLE is a work in progress, to be launched in September 2020, no further information was provided regarding how learners will be made aware of the actions taken as a result of the survey and feedback gathered. Due to these findings, the visitors could not determine how learners' involvement in the programme will contribute to the overall effectiveness of the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: The education provider evidenced a document titled, 'Enrolment form' for this standard. From reviewing this document, the visitors noted this was a risk assessment form that had been filled out by the learner and co-ordinating supervisor at the practice-based learning setting. Page one of the form referred to "guidance and notes for completing this form", however there were no guidance notes provided.

The visitors also noted page nine of the form included questions as part of a checklist covering various scenarios regarding trainees, co-ordinating supervisors within the line management relationship at the practice-based learning site. As part of this, a question was outlined to confirm whether there is a process to support learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. This was a tick box response and no further information was provided, within the form or the wider submission, regarding how learners are enabled or made aware of the process, nor what the process is.

The visitors recognised that this form constituted a risk assessment form that had to be completed as part of learners' induction at practice-based learning. The visitors understood that the co-ordinating supervisor is responsible for ensuring that learners understand the different policies and processes that learners will need to be aware of and comply with, at the practice-based learning setting. However, by seeing just a list of policy names without any content provided, the visitors could not determine if these policies ensured learners are able to recognise a situation where service users may be at risk. It was also not possible to determine how learners are supported in raising any concerns, or how they are made to understand their responsibilities regarding this when they believe the safety or wellbeing of service users is at risk. The evidence also did not address how concerns raised by learners will be considered and acted on. Therefore, the visitors could not find any evidence which shows the effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Section 6: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met for the reason(s) noted in section 5, and recommend that an approval visit is undertaken to consider the approval of the programme(s).

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	British Psychological Society
Name of programme(s)	Qualification in Forensic Psychology (Stage 2), Flexible
Date submission received	14 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15414-H1D9B5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Outcome from second review	5
Section 6: Visitors' recommendation.....	8

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) 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, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our 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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Alaster Rutherford	Independent Prescribing
Shola Apena Rogers	Practitioner psychologist Forensic psychologist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Qualification in Forensic Psychology (Stage 2)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Forensic psychologist
First intake	01 January 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 475
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09089

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	The education provider has not submitted monitoring as, due to significant staff changes, they have not collected data in this area.
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The education provider has not submitted monitoring as, due to significant staff changes, they have not collected data in this area.

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: In the submission the education provider had not submitted evidence of service user and carer and practice-based learning monitoring, as part of the expanded evidence base requirement for this year. In their covering letter, they indicated that work had started on surveys to “collect feedback from candidates, supervisors and service users”. However, they also indicated that this did not progress due to significant staff changes. In addition, the visitors noted the comments that “our programme leads meet three times per year to discuss and input into all of our approved programmes”. The visitors were unclear whether these meetings included discussions about the monitoring of service user and carer involvement or practice-based learning. The covering letter also mentioned the use of an existing system to gather feedback until a new Virtual Learning Platform (VLE) is introduced in June 2020. The visitors did not receive any further information about the existing system or how this is used in the monitoring of service users and carers involvement or practice-based learning. As such, the visitors could not confirm how the education provider makes sure the programme delivers overall quality and effectiveness on an ongoing basis. The education provider must show how they are monitoring and evaluating the programme’s quality and effectiveness, particularly in relation to service user and carer involvement and practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show there are effective and regular monitoring systems in place for practice-based learning and service user and carer involvement.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In response to this standard, the education provider did not provide evidence of their policies though provided a covering letter in which they described their plans on how to involve service users and carers in the programme. They indicated that they had plans to collect service user feedback from surveys in 2018. However, due to significant staff changes, this work did not progress and the surveys were not carried out. In addition, the mapping document also referred the visitors to information about the Qualification Reference Group (QRG) in the covering letter. The visitors were unable to locate this information. The education provider did not submit any other evidence as part of the expanded evidence base around this standard to demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear how service users and carers contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme to make sure that learners completing the programme are fit to practise. The visitors therefore require further evidence around this standard.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which shows how service users and carers are involved in the programme and contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In response to this standard, the education provider did not provide evidence of their policies though provided a covering letter in which they described their plans to involve learners in the programme. The education provider indicated that learners are able to feedback at the very start of the programme and then informally during their enrolment on the programme. This standard is about how the experience of learners is

central to the quality and effectiveness of the programme. As learner feedback is not gathered throughout the programme in a formal way, it was not clear to the visitors that learners' experiences are being considered in order to improve the programme. It also did not indicate that learners are being encouraged to be involved. The education provider indicated they intend to gather testimonials to strengthen the way they meet this SET. In addition they also indicated that the new virtual learning platform (VLE) will allow them to gather and respond to feedback in a timely manner. The visitors were unable to see the frequency, nature or detail of these testimonials or how they would be used to improve the programme. As such they did not consider the standard to be met. The education provider must show how learners are involved in improving the quality and effectiveness of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how learners are involved in the programme so that their experience is central to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider highlighted sections in the Candidate Handbook, Enrolment form Part A and Template of practice diaries. The visitors noted that the indicated sections in the Candidate Handbook related to learners upholding their own professional conduct and the safety of practice-based learning for learners. These sections did not outline the mechanism in place for learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. This standard is about helping learners recognise situations where service users may be at risk, supporting them in raising concerns and making sure action is taken in response to those concerns. The education provider indicated in their narrative for this standard that the audit tool used would allow learners to raise concerns. However, they also stated this tool is to ensure the proposed learning setting will provide a safe and effective learning experience. Therefore the visitors considered this tool did not allow for learners to raise concerns during their time in practice. In addition, the mapping document made reference to registrar clinics which learners can book onto and can be used to "raise concerns they feel cannot be raise with their Coordinating supervisor". However, from this information, the visitors were unclear if this included the discussions about the safety and wellbeing of service users. They were also unsure of the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which shows the effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Section 5: Outcome from second review

Recommendation of the visitors – approval visit required

The education provider responded to the request for further evidence set out in section 4. Following their consideration of this response, the visitors were not satisfied that there was sufficient evidence that the following standards continue to be met, for the reason(s) detailed below.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: In response to the additional documentation request, the education provider provided terms of reference (TOR) from their 'Stakeholder representative engagement group' and an Annual monitoring summary report from their Qualifications Committee on 11 October 2017 as evidence for this standard. From their review of the TOR, the visitors noted that service users and learners were identified as relevant stakeholders. Some of the responsibilities of these stakeholders included working together to gather feedback relating to employment or practice-based learning, which then gets passed onto the Qualifications Committee to review. In addition, the TOR states in Section 1.5 "Provide periodic reports on activities and emerging issues to feedback to the Qualifications Committee at each of their meetings (via the Delivery Team)". From reviewing the report from October 2017 it was stated that this committee meets three times a year which formed as part of the regular monitoring.

As outlined under Section 4 of this report, the visitors could not find any evidence demonstrating how the monitoring of service users and practice-based learning had occurred for the last two years. From reviewing the TOR, the visitors noted in responsibility 1.3 mention of using "multiple methods to seek stakeholder feedback", however there was no further information provided about what these multiple methods might be nor how this would be facilitated. From the October 2017 report, the visitors could not see any evidence showing what discussions took place when the committee members met three times a year, to suggest any monitoring of service users or practice-based learning. The visitors did note under the "Events" section that three regional training events had occurred for supervisors. However, no further information was received which outlined if these events had also been an opportunity for feedback gathering.

The education provider clarified that going forward, the Virtual Learning Platform (VLE) which was to be introduced in June 2020 to monitor surveys and feedback, was delayed due to COVID-19 and will now be launched in September 2020. Without any further information provided, the visitors were still not clear of the system or process of analysing and evaluating feedback gathered from learners or regarding practice-based learning. As outlined under Section 4, it was still not clear how the VLE will contribute to critically reviewing current programme arrangements. Due to this, the visitors could not determine whether there was a system to respond to any identified risks or challenges noted within the programme. Based on this, the visitors could not determine if the programme has regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provider referenced terms of reference (TOR) from their 'Stakeholder representative engagement group', as evidence for this standard. This document identified service users as one of the stakeholders who would be worked with to "gather feedback which contributes to the overall quality, effectiveness and development of the Society's qualifications". In the response letter provided, the education provider clarified that this was a change to how they demonstrated service users and carers' involvement in the programme going forward.

From reviewing the evidence, the visitors noted that the TOR are generic. It was not made explicitly clear whether this document applies to any specific programme or is a generic document applied across all the programmes offered by the education provider. It was not clear to the visitors which of the mentioned eleven roles and responsibilities outlined in the TOR applied to service users and carers. For example, responsibility 1.1 states “To work with stakeholders, including service users and candidates (learners), to gather feedback which contributes to the overall, effectiveness and development of the Society’s qualifications”. This clearly identifies service users and carers, though not how this will occur. Another example is responsibility 1.10 which states “To nominate Society division representatives, as appropriate, to join the meetings”. The visitors were unclear if or how service users and carers could be involved in this. It was therefore not clear during which aspects of the programme their involvement will take place. Based on this, the visitors could not determine where and how service user and carer involvement will take place appropriate to the programme.

From further clarification regarding the additional evidence, the education provider stated that service user and carer involvement will be monitored by the Professional Development Delivery Team (PDDT), who will provide the link between the Stakeholder representative engagement group and Qualifications Committee, including administration with the necessary support. Without any further information provided, it was not clear what PDDT processes are in place to plan, monitor and evaluate service user and carer involvement in the programme. Based on these findings, the visitors could not determine how service user and carers will be involved in the programme and how will their contribution add to overall quality and effectiveness of the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provider referenced terms of reference (TOR) from their ‘Stakeholder representative engagement group and a learner survey as evidence for this standard. The TOR mentioned about learners working with other stakeholders such as service user and carers, to gather feedback which would then be passed onto the Qualifications Committee for review. From a review of the documents, the visitors noted that only pages 5 to 7 of the survey had questions that related to learners’ experience of the programme and the education provider. From further clarification regarding how the learner survey is collected and utilised, the education provider stated “Currently the survey results are recorded on Questback and the Professional Development Delivery Team are responsible for collecting and sharing the feedback with the Qualifications Boards who are jointly responsible for monitoring the results and reporting any trends, and actions required to the Qualifications Committee”.

From reviewing the evidence provided, the visitors could not find any information suggesting how learners are involved in the programme other than filling out the survey. It was not clear to the visitors which of the mentioned eleven roles and responsibilities outlined in the TOR applied to learners. For example, responsibility 1.1 states “To work with stakeholders, including service users and candidates (learners), to gather feedback which contributes to the overall, effectiveness and development of the Society’s qualifications”. This clearly identifies learners, though not how this will occur. Another example is responsibility 1.6 which states “To consider feedback and recommendations from stakeholders, and to support qualification boards and divisions to make

improvements, harmonise processes and procedures wherever feasible.” The visitors were unclear if or how learners were involved in these areas.

Additionally, based on clarification provided by the education provider explaining how feedback is collected by the Qualifications Boards, it was not clear how this gets utilised and is worked upon. Based on this, the visitors could not determine whether feedback gathered is used in a meaningful way to develop or improve the programme. As the VLE is a work in progress, to be launched in September 2020, no further information was provided regarding how learners will be made aware of the actions taken as a result of the survey and feedback gathered. Due to these findings, the visitors could not determine how learners’ involvement in the programme will contribute to the overall effectiveness of the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: The education provider evidenced a document titled, ‘Enrolment form’ for this standard. From reviewing this document, the visitors noted this was a risk assessment form that had been filled out by the learner and co-ordinating supervisor at the practice-based learning setting. Page one of the form referred to “guidance and notes for completing this form”, however there were no guidance notes provided.

The visitors also noted page nine of the form included questions as part of a checklist covering various scenarios regarding trainees, co-ordinating supervisors within the line management relationship at the practice-based learning site. As part of this, a question was outlined to confirm whether there is a process to support learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. This was a tick box response and no further information was provided, within the form or the wider submission, regarding how learners are enabled or made aware of the process, nor what the process is

The visitors recognised that this form constituted a risk assessment form that had to be completed as part of learners’ induction at practice-based learning. The visitors understood that the co-ordinating supervisor is responsible for ensuring that learners understand the different policies and processes that learners will need to be aware of and comply with, at the practice-based learning setting. However, by seeing just a list of policy names without any content provided, the visitors could not determine if these policies ensured learners are able to recognise a situation where service users may be at risk. It was also not possible to determine how learners are supported in raising any concerns, or how they are made to understand their responsibilities regarding this when they believe the safety or wellbeing of service users is at risk. The evidence also did not address how concerns raised by learners will be considered and acted on. Therefore, the visitors could not find any evidence which shows the effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Section 6: Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the

standards continue to be met for the reason(s) noted in section 5, and recommend that an approval visit is undertaken to consider the approval of the programme(s).

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	British Psychological Society
Name of programme(s)	Qualification in Occupational Psychology (Stage 2) (2019), Flexible Qualification in Occupational Psychology (Stage 2), Flexible
Date submission received	14 April 2020
Case reference	CAS-15410-N2B1Z6

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review	4
Section 5: Outcome from second review	6
Section 6: Visitors’ recommendation.....	9

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) 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, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our 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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Margaret Chapman-Clarke	Practitioner psychologist - Occupational psychologist
Richard Kwiatkowski	Practitioner psychologist - Occupational psychologist
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Qualification in Occupational Psychology (Stage 2)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Occupational psychologist
First intake	01 January 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 350
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09087

Programme name	Qualification in Occupational Psychology (Stage 2) (2019)
Mode of study	FLX (Flexible)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Occupational psychologist
First intake	01 February 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 75
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM09090

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	The education provider has not submitted monitoring as, due to significant staff changes, they have not collected data in this area.
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	The education provider has not submitted monitoring as, due to significant staff changes, they have not collected data in this area.

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: Within the submission across both programmes, the education provider had not submitted evidence of service user and carer and practice-based learning monitoring, as part of the expanded evidence base requirement for this year. In their covering letter, they indicated that work had started on surveys to “collect feedback from candidates, supervisors and service users”. However, they also indicated that this did not progress due to significant staff changes. In addition, the visitors noted the comments that “our programme leads meet three times per year to discuss and input into all of our approved programmes”. The visitors were unclear whether these meetings included discussions about the monitoring of service user and carer involvement or practice-based learning. The covering letter also mentioned the use of an existing system to gather feedback until a new Virtual Learning Platform (VLE) is introduced in June 2020. The visitors did not receive any further information about the existing system or how this is used in the monitoring of service users and carers involvement or practice-based learning. As such, the visitors could not confirm how the education provider makes sure the programme delivers overall quality and effectiveness on an ongoing basis. The education provider must show how they are monitoring and evaluating the programme’s quality and effectiveness, particularly in relation to service user and carer involvement and practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show there are effective and regular monitoring systems in place for practice-based learning and service user and carer involvement.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In the submission for the Qualification in Occupational Psychology (Stage 2) programme, the education provider did not provide evidence of their policies though provided a covering letter in which they described their plans on how to involve service users and carers in the programme. They indicated that they had plans to collect service user feedback from surveys in 2018. However, due to significant staff changes, this work did not progress and the surveys were not carried out. The education provider did not submit any other evidence as part of the expanded evidence base around this standard to demonstrate how service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear how service users and carers contribute to the

overall quality and effectiveness of the programme to make sure that learners completing the programme are fit to practise.

In the submission for the Qualification in Occupational Psychology (Stage 2) (2019) programme, the visitors noted how the programme had demonstrated this standard at the visit in June 2018. The visitors also noted the covering letter referring to the surveys and Qualification Reference Group (QRG) and narrative that work had started on the surveys to “collect feedback from candidates, supervisors and service users”. However, they also indicated that this had not progressed since 2018 due to significant staff changes. As the surveys appeared to be a key way in which the programme involved service users and carers at the visit, the visitors were unsure how the programme continued to use their involvement to ensure learners completing the programme are fit to practise.

Across both programmes, the visitors therefore require further evidence around this standard to demonstrate how service users and carers contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programmes to ensure that learners completing the programmes are fit to practise.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which shows how service users and carers are involved in the programmes and contribute to their overall quality and effectiveness.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: In the submission for the Qualification in Occupational Psychology (Stage 2) programme, the education provider did not provide evidence of their policies though provided a covering letter in which they described their plans to involve learners in the programme. The education provider indicated that learners are able to feedback at the very start of the programme and then informally during their enrolment on the programme. This standard is about how the experience of learners is central to the quality and effectiveness of the programme. As learner feedback is not gathered throughout the programme in a formal way, it was not clear to the visitors that learners' experiences are being considered in order to improve the programme. It also did not indicate that learners are being encouraged to be involved. The education provider indicated they intend to gather testimonials to strengthen the way they meet this SET. In addition they also indicated that the new virtual learning platform (VLE) will allow them to gather and respond to feedback in a timely manner. The visitors were unable to see the frequency, nature or detail of these testimonials or how they would be used to improve the programme.

In the submission for the Qualification in Occupational Psychology (Stage 2) (2019) programme, the visitors noted how the programme had demonstrated this standard at the visit in June 2018. The visitors also noted the covering letter referring to the surveys and Qualification Reference Group (QRG) and narrative that work had started on the surveys to “collect feedback from candidates, supervisors and service users”. However, they also indicated that this had not progressed since 2018 due to significant staff changes. The visitors also noted the plans by the education provider to make changes to how they involve learners through the collection of testimonials and the new VLE platform. As the surveys appeared to be a key way in which the programme involved learners at the visit, the visitors were unsure how the programme continued to use learner involvement in a meaningful way to improve the programme.

Across both programmes, the visitors therefore require further evidence around this standard to demonstrate how learners experience is central to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programmes.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how learners are involved in the programme so that their experience is central to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: To evidence this standard for the Qualification in Occupational Psychology (Stage 2), the education provider highlighted sections in the Candidate Handbook, Regulations for the Society's Postgraduate Qualifications and the Annual Supervised Practice Review. The visitors noted that the indicated sections in the Candidate Handbook related to learners upholding their own professional conduct and the safety of practice-based learning for learners. These sections did not outline the mechanism in place for learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. This standard is about helping learners recognise situations where service users may be at risk, supporting them in raising concerns and making sure action is taken in response to those concerns. The education provider indicated in their narrative for this standard that learners complete the Annual Supervised Practice Review which "includes details of support mechanisms for candidates". The visitors considered this tool did not allow for learners to raise concerns during their time in practice about the safety and wellbeing of service users. In addition, the mapping document made reference to a formal quarterly meeting the learners will have with their Co-ordinating Supervisors. Learners are also required to agree "terms with your proposed Co-ordinating Supervisor" prior to starting the programme. This included agreement of how often meetings will take place and the communication method. However, from this information, the visitors were unclear if this included discussions about the safety and wellbeing of service users. They were also unsure of the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which shows the effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Section 5: Outcome from second review

Recommendation of the visitors – approval visit required

The education provider responded to the request for further evidence set out in section 4. Following their consideration of this response, the visitors were not satisfied that there was sufficient evidence that the following standards continue to be met, for the reason(s) detailed below.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: In response to the additional documentation request, the education provider provided terms of reference (TOR) from their 'Stakeholder representative engagement group' and an Annual monitoring summary report from their Qualifications Committee on 11 October 2017 as evidence for this standard. From their review of the TOR, the

visitors noted that service users and learners were identified as relevant stakeholders. Some of the responsibilities of these stakeholders included working together to gather feedback relating to employment or practice-based learning, which then gets passed onto the Qualifications Committee to review. In addition, the TOR states in Section 1.5 “Provide periodic reports on activities and emerging issues to feedback to the Qualifications Committee at each of their meetings (via the Delivery Team)”. From reviewing the report from October 2017 it was stated that this committee meets three times a year which formed as part of the regular monitoring.

As outlined under Section 4 of this report, the visitors could not find any evidence demonstrating how the monitoring of service users and practice-based learning had occurred for the last two years. From reviewing the TOR, the visitors noted in responsibility 1.3 mention of using “multiple methods to seek stakeholder feedback”, however there was no further information provided about what these multiple methods might be nor how this would be facilitated. From the October 2017 report, the visitors could not see any evidence showing what discussions took place when the committee members met three times a year, to suggest any monitoring of service users or practice-based learning. The visitors did note under the “Events” section that three regional training events had occurred for supervisors. However, no further information was received which outlined if these events had also been an opportunity for feedback gathering.

The education provider clarified that going forward, the Virtual Learning Platform (VLE) which was to be introduced in June 2020 to monitor surveys and feedback, was delayed due to COVID-19 and will now be launched in September 2020. Without any further information provided, the visitors were still not clear of the system or process of analysing and evaluating feedback gathered from learners or regarding practice-based learning. As outlined under Section 4, it was still not clear how the VLE will contribute to critically reviewing current programme arrangements. Due to this, the visitors could not determine whether there was a system to respond to any identified risks or challenges noted within the programme. Based on this, the visitors could not determine if the programme has regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provider referenced terms of reference (TOR) from their ‘Stakeholder representative engagement group’, as evidence for this standard. This document identified service users as one of the stakeholders who would be worked with to “gather feedback which contributes to the overall quality, effectiveness and development of the Society’s qualifications”. In the response letter provided, the education provider clarified that this was a change to how they demonstrated service users and carers’ involvement in the programme going forward.

From reviewing the evidence, the visitors noted that the TOR are generic. It was not made explicitly clear whether this document applies to any specific programme or is a generic document applied across all the programmes offered by the education provider. It was not clear to the visitors which of the mentioned eleven roles and responsibilities outlined in the TOR applied to service users and carers. For example, responsibility 1.1 states “To work with stakeholders, including service users and candidates (learners), to gather feedback which contributes to the overall, effectiveness and development of the

Society's qualifications". This clearly identifies service users and carers, though not how this will occur. Another example is responsibility 1.10 which states "To nominate Society division representatives, as appropriate, to join the meetings". The visitors were unclear if or how service users and carers could be involved in this. It was therefore not clear during which aspects of the programme their involvement will take place. Based on this, the visitors could not determine where and how service user and carer involvement will take place appropriate to the programme.

From further clarification regarding the additional evidence, the education provider stated that service user and carer involvement will be monitored by the Professional Development Delivery Team (PDDT), who will provide the link between the Stakeholder representative engagement group and Qualifications Committee, including administration with the necessary support. Without any further information provided, it was not clear what PDDT processes are in place to plan, monitor and evaluate service user and carer involvement in the programme. Based on these findings, the visitors could not determine how service user and carers will be involved in the programme and how will their contribution add to overall quality and effectiveness of the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provider referenced terms of reference (TOR) from their 'Stakeholder representative engagement group and a learner survey as evidence for this standard. The TOR mentioned about learners working with other stakeholders such as service user and carers, to gather feedback which would then be passed onto the Qualifications Committee for review. From a review of the documents, the visitors noted that only pages 5 to 7 of the survey had questions that related to learners' experience of the programme and the education provider. From further clarification regarding how the learner survey is collected and utilised, the education provider stated "Currently the survey results are recorded on Questback and the Professional Development Delivery Team are responsible for collecting and sharing the feedback with the Qualifications Boards who are jointly responsible for monitoring the results and reporting any trends, and actions required to the Qualifications Committee".

From reviewing the evidence provided, the visitors could not find any information suggesting how learners are involved in the programme other than filling out the survey. It was not clear to the visitors which of the mentioned eleven roles and responsibilities outlined in the TOR applied to learners. For example, responsibility 1.1 states "To work with stakeholders, including service users and candidates (learners), to gather feedback which contributes to the overall, effectiveness and development of the Society's qualifications". This clearly identifies learners, though not how this will occur. Another example is responsibility 1.6 which states "To consider feedback and recommendations from stakeholders, and to support qualification boards and divisions to make improvements, harmonise processes and procedures wherever feasible." The visitors were unclear if or how learners were involved in these areas.

Additionally, based on clarification provided by the education provider explaining how feedback is collected by the Qualifications Boards, it was not clear how this gets utilised and is worked upon. Based on this, the visitors could not determine whether feedback gathered is used in a meaningful way to develop or improve the programme. As the VLE is a work in progress, to be launched in September 2020, no further information

was provided regarding how learners will be made aware of the actions taken as a result of the survey and feedback gathered. Due to these findings, the visitors could not determine how learners' involvement in the programme will contribute to the overall effectiveness of the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that a visit is undertaken to demonstrate how this standard continues to be met.

Section 6: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met for the reason(s) noted in section 5, and recommend that an approval visit is undertaken to consider the approval of the programme(s).

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 24 September 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

