



Hypno-Psychotherapy Section

Quinquennial Review and Section Investigation Assessment Visit Report

2008

**National College of Hypnosis and Psychotherapy
(NCHP)**

Background:

This report combines the scheduled Quinquennial Review Process assessment visit with the elements of the investigation assessment for the UKCP's Hypno-Psychotherapy Section. For the purposes of the assessment criteria were defined (See Appendix A) for reference alongside the core UKCP Training Requirements (appendix B).

Although the primary focus and construction of the assessment visit was the QR process, the adjustment to the Sections procedures occasioned by the extant situation within Section and the reality of the ongoing investigation into the Section's MOs and the Section's procedures and standards inevitably influences the structure of this report and the criteria behind the assessment.

Ultimately the intention is that the process will ensure that each organisation with the Hypno-Psychotherapy Section has completed a QR assessment process that is:

- clearly aligned with QR practice across the organisation;
- congruent with the goals of assuring quality within UKCP Member Organisations;
- a demonstrably effective means of ensuring control of quality in relation to core and section standards to MOs and Trainings leading to registration;
- Transparent and accountable
- Capable of facilitating organisations in the review and development of their policy, criteria, practice and standards to ensure their goals – internal and external can be achieved and are aligned with UKCP policy and practice
- supportive of the work by the Hypno-Psychotherapy Section to review and develop Section criteria, policy and practice to address past difficulties and respond to the future needs of UKCP and the modality.

UKCP has agreed **principles** on which to base its **Training Standards** and **policies** to **regulate** them across all psychotherapy modalities. These principles and policies concern the Council's Training Standards Committee, the Sections' Training Standards Committees and Accreditation Committees and the individual Training Organisations which devise and run psychotherapy training courses leading to registration with the Council.

Basic Training Standards were established in 1993 and published as '**Training Requirements of UKCP**'. A Regulatory Framework to integrate the Training Standards with Training Outcomes was agreed in 2001 and published as **UKCP Training Standards: Policy and Principles**.

The UKCP's core documents set out:

- the Guiding Principles on which all psychotherapy training should be based;
- the Regulatory Framework which will ensure that standards and outcomes of training are enforced;

- the responsibilities of the various bodies involved;
- the basic Training Requirements.

These may be seen at appendix B to this report.

Introduction:

This report is structured to provide both an account of the Assessment visit to NCHP and a presentation of the review of material provided by NCHP prior to the visit and that gained by the assessment team at the visit. The report provides specific conclusions that are identified as being:

- Requirements;
- Strong Recommendations;
- Recommendations;
- Advice and guidance

Requirements will have a date for completion and may also have a date at which their implementation will be assessed.

The report seeks where ever possible to clearly describe what criteria have been used in the assessment, where those criteria originate and the basis on which they have been applied. However, the parallel review of Hypno-Psychotherapy Section practice and standards may impact on this process in some areas – these will be identified clearly where ever possible.

QR Assessment Visit Report:

1. Visit Information:

1.1 Organisation Being Assessed:

The National College of Hypnosis and Psychotherapy (NCHP)

1.2 Date of Assessment Visit:

20 April 2008

1.3 Location of Assessment:

Bewleys Hotel
City Walk
Sweet Street
Leeds
LS11 9AT

1.4 Administrative Address of Organisation (if different):

National College of Hypnosis and Psychotherapy™
PO Box 5779,
Loughborough,
LE12 5ZF
Tel: 0845 2578735
E.mail: enquiries@nchp.org.uk

1.5 Assessment Team:

1.5.a Lead Assessor - **Mike Bowen** (UKCP Staff – Regulation and Standards Consultant);

1.5.b Second Assessor - **Carmen Ablack** (UKCP Chair of Training Standards / Standards Board)

2. Organisational Overview:

(Does the organisational structure ensure that the staff are appropriately accountable and interests and concerns can be taken seriously and are capable of being held within suitable frameworks?)

2.1 Type of Organisation / UKCP Status: NCHP is a UKCP Training Organisation

2.2 Management and Governance:

2.2.1 NCHP was formed as a training organisation in 1977. It participated as a founding member of UKCP's precursors and of UKCP itself.

2.2.2 NCHP has the following structural components: Board of Directors; Academic Board; Independent Examination Moderation Board and a Research Ethics Committee. In view of its inherent independence the latter of these inevitably is concerned primarily with specific tasks and plays little role in the management of the organisation, though has a position in respect of the over all governance of the NCHP.

2.2.3 The Board of Directors appoints the Chair of NCHP. NCHP is structured as a Company Limited by Guarantee without share capital and defined in its constitution as not for profit. It transferred to this status in July 2005, having previously been owned by its directors as a for profit enterprise.

2.2.4 NCHP currently has approximately 150 student / trainee members, which readily meets the UKCP's minimum membership criterion.

2.2.5 **Code of Ethics:** there was some discussion in relation to NCHP's code of Ethics during which it was agreed that details of specific issues identified by the assessors would be included in this report:

2.2.5.a (p1. no.3- Code of Ethics for Trainers) the assessors expressed the view that this clause required specific reference to Psychotherapy.

2.2.5.b (p1-2 no.5 Code of Ethics for Trainers) this clause needs to be revisited and revised. As it stands the only consequence for entering into an 'inappropriate relationship' with a trainee is that the arrangements for that students training to be altered. There appears to be no acknowledgement of the potential for such conduct to have significance in terms of employment (as a trainer) or fitness to practice / registration as a psychotherapist.

2.2.5.c (p2 no.6 Code of Ethics for Trainers) NCHP need to review this clause in relation to both UKCP Minimum Ethical requirements and ASA standards, with specific regard to the issue of 'outcomes'. It would not normally be acceptable for any training or psychotherapist to make reference in their advertising to specific outcomes that relate to efficacy of the treatment.

- 2.2.5.d (p2 no 1 - Code of Conduct for Training,): the 'agreed minimum level' of indemnity insurance required needs to be stipulated.
- 2.2.5.e (p2 2b – Code of Conduct for Training, no): The intended meaning of this clause was not clear.
- 2.2.5.f (p2 no 2d – Code of Conduct for Training,): This clause should be amended to include other professional bodies, associations or registrations.
- 2.2.5.g (p2 – Code of Conduct for Training, no 4): The reference to tutors and supervisors being available 'as needed', while laudable in aspirational terms, seems to impose a potentially unreasonable burden upon the individuals in these roles. It is therefore a potential source of problems. Revising the wording to something like: *'supervisors and tutors should ensure that they are able to meet NCHP expectations relating to their reasonable availability to trainees, as described in their contract as a tutor or supervisor.'*

The final sentence of this clause needs to be adjusted as there are no formal UKCP standards for supervision at this time. NCHP could elaborate some straightforward standards (some many years post registration practice, continued UKCP registration, completion of a specific training in supervision etc) in lieu of these in the interim prior to the release of such standards by the centre.

- 2.2.5.h (p2-3 no 5 - Code of Conduct for Training,): this appears to be a requirement aimed at other training organisations. It should be noted that UKCP does not currently 'license' or accredit organisations to act as umbrella bodies for other trainings or trainers in respect of courses that lead to UKCP registration. NCHP must consider this in relation to its delivery of trainings at other sites and develop a clear framework within which those trainings are identifiable (supported by evidence) as NCHP trainings. This should include clear evidence of the management, governance and quality assurance and control mechanisms by which NCHP trainings at all sites are monitored and through which relevant standards are maintained.

NCHP must ensure that appropriate, relevant records for all NCHPA trainees at all training sites be maintained in a single, consistent and appropriate administrative system.

The assessors would recommend that NCHP prioritise the development and publication of a clear data management policy. This should include information about what data is held for each class of data subject (applicants, trainees, graduates, staff, officers, trainers, supervisors), how this is held and how it will be processed and used within the organisation and externally etc. There should also be clearly structured declaration forms for each

class of data subject. The policy should include details of NCHP's current registration as a data controller with the Office of the Information Commissioner. The assessors acknowledged NCHP's confirmation that they are currently registered as a data controller.

- 2.2.5.i (p3 no 6 - Code of Conduct for Training,): See above. NCHP would be well advised to develop a clear policy document describing its standards for training venues as this would form a valuable tool in demonstrating the organisations approach to quality. However, it should be made very clear how those standards apply to each element of NCHP's training activities. While UKCP is not concerned with those of NCHP's trainings that do not lead to UKCP registration, all those trainings that provide elements of the UKCP pathway or that are clearly part of that pathway must clearly sit within NCHP as an organisation, or be the subject of clear descriptions and evidence of how and why NCHP has outsourced them (for example in relation to the module on research methods) and how they are quality assured and controlled.
- 2.2.5.j (p3 no 7 - Code of Conduct for Training): Credentials – This clause should be clarified by the inclusion of information relating to what constitutes a valid qualification (i.e. academic and professional qualifications recognised in the UK)
- 2.2.5.k (p3 no 7 - Code of Conduct for Training): Complaints and discipline – this clause contains a further reference to other organisations that could be read as implying that NCHP is acting to license other training providers. If this is the case it should be clearly specified how those trainings delivered by such independent bodies are distinguished from NCHP's UKCP pathway.
- 2.2.5.l **General:** there did not appear to be separate Codes of Ethics and Practise / Conduct covering the clinical practice of Trainees. The assessors understand that trainees are required to join NRHP at the point at which they begin seeing clients as part of their training. If the effect of this is that NCHP intends trainees to be subject to the NRHP Codes of Ethics and Practise / Conduct for professional practise, then this should be made clear within NCHP's ethical documents. Ideally this could be achieved by including NRHP's codes within the hand book and as part of the folio of NCHP's ethical documents.
- 2.2.5.m Complaints and Disciplinary processes: This document needs to be re written or a new document created to ensure that NCHP has both a clear procedure for addressing fitness to practise complaint in relation to its trainees and an appropriate grievance procedure capable of addressing the following:

- (i) Trainee complaints in relation to the training;
- (ii) Trainee complaints about other trainees or trainers;
- (iii) Trainers complaints against other trainers or NCHP as an organisation;
- (iv) the complaints / grievances of any other NCHP employee.

Addressing these points might be achieved through adapting or clearly formally adopting the NRHP Fitness to Practice Complaints procedure for NCHP trainees for example. In either case the process should contain a clear section on Appeals to NCHP and to the UKCP CFAP. There are many examples of sound grievance procedures for organisations available.

Pursuant to this it seems sensible to recommend that NCHP create a code of conduct for trainees as trainees and to create or clearly identify which code of ethics and conduct trainees are bound by when they commence practicing.

2.2.5.n Appeals Policy Document: this appears to apply to any appeal in respect of any of NCHP's procedures / rules. It helpful to distinguish between Fitness to Practise Appeals (dealt with above at 2.2.5.m final paragraph) and other appeals (for example against decisions on admissions, marking, examinations, being asked to leave the training etc...). For similar reasons any appeal under the grievance procedure should be separated from any specific appeals on decisions that do not necessitate accessing this process, but in respect of which an appeal may be allowed / necessary / appropriate.

2.2.6 NCHP noted that they had for some time been trying to establish regular / consistent trainee representation on the Academic Board to enhance their governance system. They have found it hard to recruit trainees to take up such positions.

2.2.7 **Data Protection:** It was confirmed that NCHP is registered with the Information Commissioners Office. The assessors suggested that it would be advisable for a data Retention and Management Policy to be created to describe the nature of and purposes for which data was held and how it was processed etc.

2.2.8 **Equalities and Diversity Document:** The assessors noted that NCHP's Equalities and Diversity document was well written and presented clearly within the information in the submission and in its location within the information provided to trainees. IT was felt that the document provided a very good foundation for further development in this area.

2.2.9 **Future Development of Training:** NCHP noted that they were looking into the viability of seeking MA accreditation for their training through a UK University.

2.3 Assessment: The primary responsibility for reviewing the management and governance arrangements for UKCP MOs in relation to UKCP's criteria for membership and current guidance on best practice lies with the UKCP Membership Committee. The assessment visit must, however, consider the impact of the management and governance of organisations on their capacity to adequately fulfil specific functions as a training, accrediting or listing body of UKCP and in respect of the effective application of Section standards.

2.3.1 NCHP's Management and Governance structures are essentially congruent with UKCP's requirements, criteria and expectations. It is certainly positive to see that NCHP has moved to being a not for profit organisation as this clearly underlines the organisations position as an education provider for professional training and the concomitant commitment to standards as the first priority.

2.3.2 It would be positive to see some further development of the Academic Board to include regular opportunities for formal and informal input from trainees.

2.3.3 Similarly it would be useful for NCHP to consider whether there would be scope to expand the Research Ethics Committee's remit to allow it to become a full Ethics Committee. Operating with an ethics committee has the potential to further augment the organisation's capacity to provide scope for trainees to engage with the organisation and can strengthen the appreciation or ethics within the professional trainings that an organisation delivers.

3. Review of Accommodation for Training: *(including teaching space, trainee facilities and administration)*

3.1 Training Space:

3.1.1 The training took place at the Bewleys Hotel in a meeting room. This was modern and offered adequate space for the training session observed. The room in which the observed training occurred had good access for all abilities / needs, though doors between the entrance and the room itself were manual and could be difficult to open without assistance.

3.1.2 The room was largely occupied by a boardroom style table and chairs. Trainees gathered toward one end of this where the trainer had flip charts set up. The room was bright and modern.

3.1.3 Water and other refreshments were available in the room for trainees.

3.2 Trainee Facilities:

3.2.1 The training venue offered scope for those trainees who had travelled some distance to attend the weekend to seek accommodation at the venue. The hotel was located within walking distance of the local station and offered good road access and parking.

3.2.2 Food and drink were available on site as were IT facilities though the use of these would incur a charge from the hotel.

3.2.3 There was no library available to trainees. This was true for both the visit site and the administrative centre of NCHP. It was recognised that this was influenced by the structuring of the training with significant distance learning and self directed learning, in combination with the absence of a dedicated training venue.

3.3 Administration:

3.3.1 It was not possible to assess the organisation's administration facilities as these were located elsewhere. The assessors' experience of communicating with the organization prior to the visit and the material submitted supported a tentative view that the organisation was well run in administrative terms.

3.3.2 Trainees reported that they received good responses to telephone calls and emails and did not raise any concerns relating to their general experience of the administration of NCHP.

3.3.3 The document submission was provided on time and was very clear and well presented, with documents reproduced and written to a good standard. The general impression gained by the assessors was that NCHP was efficiently run and supported by very effective administration systems.

3.4 Assessment:

- 3.4.1 **Library:** The absence of a fixed venue prevents NCHP from offering Library facilities to trainees. In relation to other aspects of the training NCHP has provided some good support facilities through web based infrastructures. The augmentation of the web resources to include additional guidance and facilities specifically for relevant literature could go some way to ameliorating the effect of not having a physical library.
- 3.4.2 **Access:** it was clear that some thought had been given to selecting a venue with good access and scope for meeting a range of trainee needs should this be necessary. Given this it would be a positive development to see some attention given to this approach in some of the literature offered to trainees and prospective trainees as it is an explicit enactment of the NCHP diversity and equalities policy.
- 3.4.3 **Administration:** representing an organisation to external assessors is perhaps additionally complex where the review of the organisation does not occur at the same location as that at which the organisation's administration actually occurs. It may be helpful to both future reviews and to NCHP in presenting the organisation to others in different contexts to consider developing a structural diagram or diagrams to show what happens where and who is responsible. This would readily show where documents (hard or electronic) were held / processed and could support a better communication of NCHP's processes and structures generally.
- 3.4.4 **General:** there are pros and cons to almost any training venue. Generally the venue visited offered a good standard of general facilities and was clear, bright and modern, with few distractions. However, as it was not a dedicated NCHP training space there is perhaps an additional challenge for the organisation in terms of ensuring that the organisations ethos and character are communicated to trainees more clearly through other means as they can not easily be built up over time in a consistent venue.

4. Observation of Training Session:

- 4.1 The trainer was Dr Josie Harder. The session observed was a lecture on the integration of Hypnotherapy Techniques and scripts into hypnotherapy practice. It was delivered to a group of 6 trainees who were close to the end of their first year of training with NCHP.
- 4.2. Although the initial approach in the session observed was didactic the trainer readily engaged the group in discussion and was able to manage the balance between addressing the material set out to cover and allowing scope to explore questions and examples raised by the group. The trainees were enthusiastic and engaged, demonstrating an interest in the subject that was clearly founded on reading beyond the preparatory material provided from the session.
- 4.3. A number of texts were referred to during the course of the session, some new to the trainees others that were apparently quite familiar. Copies of a number of these were available during the session.
- 4.4. Given this was a small group teaching session, it was surprising that the group's process was not addressed by the trainer in the context of what was being taught. This is a comment on linkage and immediacy in teaching in the context of psychotherapy training. Even at an early stage of training such linkage would be expected as a way of signposting what the trainee needs to develop the capacity to attend to as a whole.
- 4.5. The focus on the specific use of language was interesting and well explored, with some well chosen examples. There was a contextual opportunity that could be developed in future of inviting the reflexive as well as the reflective practitioner to develop in relation to the material being taught.

4.4 Assessment: The purpose of observing a training session is to provide an opportunity for assessors to consider the following questions:

- (i) Did the teaching observed provide evidence that the trainer is competent in the subject area?
- (ii) Were appropriate teaching methods observed?
- (iii) Was the trainer able to relate appropriately to trainee?
- (iv) Was there a level of trainee engagement appropriate to the levels of training within the context of the course as a whole?

4.4.a UKCP Core Training Standards require that all trainings be at the equivalent of a Masters level. One of the strengths of UKCP trainings collectively is the diversity in the structure, approach and style of trainings. This has the potential to afford the gamut of UKCP trainings as a whole scope to offer flexibility, in terms of learning preferences and practical access to training for a range of potential trainees. This diversity remains in keeping with the spirit and ethos of the UKCP's

approach to training. Due to the range of program structures assessing trainings is more complex than it might otherwise be.

- 4.4.b** The session observed was consistent with a Masters level approach to training. Trainees took an active role in the exploration of material and contributed their own fresh material to the discussion, derived from their reading around the topics covered. It was clear that trainees had taken time to prepare for the weekend and were engaged with the subject matter in a way that was directed at both using the session to gain new information and also to share their own ideas and interpretation of other information that they associated with the subject matter.
- 4.4.c** The Trainer was confident and competent as a trainer and as a facilitator of the group's discussion. The subject matter was addressed at an appropriate level. A good rapport appeared to exist between the trainer and trainees and humour ran as a well-managed thread through the session. Useful reference was made to research evidence.
- 4.4.d** The content was considered appropriate to the point in the training at which this session was located. The content that was specific to the theoretical approach was supported by some reference to other approaches / models, although these were predominantly psychological or NLP. Some further integration of other psychotherapy theories / approaches could enhance this level of training by offering support to the trainees in developing their critical awareness of the strengths and limits of the Hypno Psychotherapy approach.
- 4.4.e** The assessors were left with a question about how the relationship between client and psychotherapist is addressed in the various training elements – given this is training in psychotherapy. At an early stage of training we would expect this to be referred to by the trainer.

5. Discussion with Trainers:

- 5.1** 2 trainers were available to meet with the assessors on the day – Josie Fraser and Jon Beilby. The assessors met the trainers independently from the members of the board. Some general information about how trainers interacted with NCHP and how their work and relationship with the organisation were managed was provided. Trainers meet at the Academic Board at least once a year. Between meetings there is an active email forum that all NCHP trainers participate in. The trainers considered this useful and supportive as well as being congruent with the NCHP's broad approach to training which was founded on a significant proportion of distance and self directed learning. This meant that it was not practical or necessary for trainers to share a geographical location. It was apparent that the trainers enjoyed and valued their work at NCHP. It was noted that there was considerable discussion through this forum in relation to the development of training notes and review of examiners reports etc.
- 5.2** There was some discussion of NCHP's approach to training, and in particular the progression from teaching techniques to training in the practice of psychotherapy. The structure of the weekends that form the primary taught contact time for the trainees was examined. It was acknowledged that NCHP Stage 1 was very practically focused on the development of an understanding of hypnosis techniques, covering areas such as abreactions and contra indications in order to assist trainees to develop to the point of being able to work with those techniques safely.
- 5.3 Theoretical Model:** the NCHP's presentation of their training as being eclectic and integrated was discussed. Trainers expressed the view that although it was possible to step off the training pathway at various levels, that the pathway as a whole worked to integrate the acquisition of hypnosis techniques into the practice of psychotherapy, in which it could be used as tool. Wider psychotherapeutic theory was draw from a range of sources and taught as part of the over all approach, which was otherwise predominantly focused on Ericksonian theory. Currently there is very limited use of external speaks / trainers from outside of the modality on the training at any level.
- 5.4 External Examiner:** Brenda Maciejkowicz' was identified as NCHP's external examiner. It was noted that the previous examiner had been Alf Thompson and that NCHP needed to ensure that the examiner was changed regularly every 5 years. The previous external examiner's report was available in the submission.
- 5.5 Entry Requirements:** trainers reported that they considered NCHP to pay careful attention to the application of entry criteria and to operate a sound process. All applicants were reviewed to ensure their written applications met base criteria and then offered an initial interview over the phone with a senior NCHP trainer. The description of the process

met with the understanding gained from the submission. It was useful to hear that trainers had confidence in the process.

5.6 Supervision of Trainee Practise:

5.6.1 For early practice of hypnotic techniques trainers acted in an informal supervisory role, providing guidance and support over the phone and via email. At the point (usually the end of stage 2 of the training) at which trainees were ready to commence working with psychotherapy clients they were required to work with an approved supervisor to support this work.

5.6.2 Supervised practice requirements were at a level that was consistent with the extant Section requirements.

5.6.3 Once engaged in psychotherapy training practice trainees were also required to join NRHP and work under their code of ethics and procedures for fitness to practice matters.

5.7 Trainee Records:

5.7.1 The question of academic transcripts was raised in relation to NCHP's record keeping for trainees. No examples of trainees' records were available as these were not a standard item for QR assessments and the assessment was not taking place at NCHP's administrative office. It was noted that there was an increasing emphasis on clear, complete and accessible records.

5.7.2 NCHP confirmed that trainees' records were held electronically. Older records were filed but there was a plan to convert these to electronic format to aid accessibility.

5.7.3 It was pointed out that academic transcripts should be made available for all future assessments of the MO.

5.8 Assessment:

5.8.a NCHP presented a clear relationship between the organisation and its trainers. The trainers available at the assessment were well qualified and experienced both as trainers for a master's level equivalent training and as professionals in the Hypno-Psychotherapy field. They were clearly engaged with and committed to the training and NCHP.

5.8.b The assessors felt that there were still unfulfilled opportunities that NCHP could reasonably explore in relation to broadening their trainees' exposure to trainers from other modalities and from outside of the organisation. It was certainly positive that the Research module occurred previously at Manchester University as this began to introduce to trainees the concept of the need to integrate broad professional skills and knowledge to their specific field of Hypno-Psychotherapy. It would be useful if a similar arrangement could be reinstated. The inclusion of further input from non-modality trainers would facilitate NCHP in the

work to develop and evidence the depth of trainees capacity to critically evaluate and communicate the theoretical model taught at NCHP, and thus their capacity to reflectively and reflexively apply that model to their practice.

5.8.c The Training staff at NCHP were able to respond clearly to the assessors questions on all aspects of the training. It was evident that the core staff were deeply involved with both the delivery and administrative / systems aspect of the training.

5.8.d Trainers communicated their understanding of the trainings place within the range of psychotherapy trainings with reasonable clarity. Although the handbook and online material was generally well structured and clear (including some excellent guidance on referencing for trainees, and some well designed systems to support distance and self directed learning, for example) the assessors view was that the clarity of presentation by the trainers as a group in person was not yet fully matched by the documentation in all areas.

5.8.e There remains a concern relating to the clarity around the point in the training at which a trainee effectively ceases to be practicing with Hypnotic Techniques and makes a transition to working psychotherapeutically with clients. Normally this is a clear transition point within UKCP trainings (not withstanding that the majority of trainings potentially work with some trainees who enter the training with prior training and existing practices as counsellors or even psychotherapists) that is identifiable by an assessment of competence and a feedback to the trainees.

5.8.f Although the trainers were clearly able to relate the development through the training to the objective of developing psychotherapist graduates, the absence of such a clear assessment of competence to commence practice as a psychotherapist contributes to the blurring of the boundaries between the options for trainees to complete purely Hypnotherapy trainings at NCHP

6. Discussion with Trainees:

- 6.1** Trainees were available to meet with the assessors (1♀ and 5♂). The meeting occurred over lunch without NCHP staff or trainers present. The trainees were a diverse group in terms of their experience and previous training – engineering, IT, training, Nursing, Marketing, Healthcare sales, military, teaching, advisor to schools, doctor, public health professional, diplomat.
- 6.2** The discussion explored the groups' reasons for commencing the training at NCHP. The group described the rigour of the training and the fact that it was accredited as being very important in their selection of the course. They described some fairly extensive and careful analysis of the field of possible trainings. All of the trainees present were currently intending to complete the NCHP UKCP pathway and seek registration with UKCP.
- 6.3** The trainees were consistent in their expression of the view that they valued and enjoyed the experience of being actively engaged in the learning process, both during the weekend sessions and in between via email forums and discussion groups. Peer to peer learning was seen as a positive attribute of the NCHP experience for them.
- 6.4** All of the trainees were apparently engaged with the theory of psychotherapy and reported that this entered the training from stage 1 and that they commenced looking at alternate theoretical models from the start of the course alongside the introduction to Hypnosis techniques and theory. The discussion demonstrated an awareness of other approaches.
- 6.5** It was clear that the group of trainees were fully engaged with the training itself and the group of peers in a lively and positive way that left room for questioning and mutual support for the members.
- 6.6** Contact with Trainers and Staff: trainees reported a range of positive experiences of getting sound support and swift, effective responses from trainers and staff between weekends. They felt supported to develop their independent study and peer to peer learning, but expressed the desire for further weekends dedicated to this. They had already met as a study group and were anticipating / planning for this to continue and develop through the retraining. All of the trainees were enthusiastic about the future elements of the training and reported that they were happy with the framework surrounding the distance and self directed learning.

6.7 Assessment:

- 6.7.a** The trainees were from a range of employment, social and cultural backgrounds with a varied set of academic experiences prior to entry to the training. All of the trainees had relevant prior training that readily satisfied the UKCP requirements for entry to trainings.

6.7.b In discussion the trainees clearly understood that they were training to become psychotherapists and were intending to pursue the NHCP pathway through to UKCP registration. The assessors noted that there was alongside this understanding a parallel linguistic overlap or conflation in the language used with reference to hypnotherapy and psychotherapy. This suggests that NCHP would benefit from reviewing its training material to consider how to more clearly communicate and develop clarity around the distinctions between hypnotherapy, hypnotic techniques and Hypno-Psychotherapy as a Psychotherapy. It seems likely that the trainers at NCHP can achieve this, provided attention is given to it as an area for development

6.7.c Trainees clearly felt supported and engaged with the training and valued the training's structure, which allowed them to fit it around busy lives. The group appeared clear about the fact that the latter stages of the training demanded significant commitment of time in terms of the self-directed and distance learning. The assessors considered that some of the comments from the trainees would suggest that NCHP's systems for supporting (and alongside this for logging, assessing and evidencing) trainees engagement in these areas would be purposeful. Consideration could be given to increasing the number of opportunities for trainees to come together face to face during the later stages of the course. Further augmentation (which the assessors understand to be planned) of the online forums and email groups would also be beneficial to the trainees' experience in the assessors views.

7. Assessment of Written work:

- 7.1 A range of written work was made available. These included shorter essays and case studies and final papers / case studies. They spanned a period from the end of the 1990s through to the last few years, though the majority were from between 2003 and 2008.
- 7.2 There was variation across the range of work with some pieces clearly identifiable as meeting expectations for work at master's level or equivalent. Some of the examples of work from earlier in the training process (shorter pieces) lacked sufficient critical analysis a refinement in structure and content to sit at the equivalent of a Master's level.
- 7.3 The requirement for UKCP accrediting trainings to develop trainees' capacity to demonstrate a reflective and reflexive approach to practice and their capacity to present this approach in their written work was also considered. While some of the work demonstrated this to an acceptable degree, this was identified as a theme across many of the examples that indicated at need to give greater attention to this aspect of written material, and thus to the trainings capacity to equip trainees to produce such work.
- 7.4 The assessors noted that there were 2 examples of final papers that were written on subjects relating to hypnotherapy techniques. This would not now be acceptable as a suitable topic for final work on a UKCP accredited Psychotherapy training. Final papers from later in the timeline of available examples were generally more congruent with the expectation that such work be directly related to Psychotherapy theory and practice.
- 7.5 A further theme that emerged related to the overall structure and lay out of the work. While there is no single 'correct' way of approaching such final papers, there were several examples across the samples that had inadequate sections for presenting conclusions, or drawing together the discussion into a final closing point.
- 7.6 The assessors considered that the NCHP might benefit from considering introducing learning portfolios as a means of further supporting trainees in the ordering, presentation and structuring of their work. It was noted that NCHP already provided a good range of on-line facilities and a trainee handbook that offered good guidance on, for example, referencing.
- 7.7 Developing a piece of written work associated with a mental health placement was also considered an important area for future development.

7.8 Assessment:

- 7.8.a** There was significant variation across the work reviewed, both in terms of the standard and the time at which it had been produced. It was clear that NCHP had been proactively engaged in developing the assessed written components of the training over the past 10 years – particularly over the past 5 years.
- 7.8.b** The degree of variation across the range of work available led the assessors to conclude that there remained work to be undertaken in this area. NCHP has some well constructed guidance for trainees on the use of referencing and on writing generally. This was not consistently evidenced in the work reviewed. This suggests that further engagement with trainees to enhance their understanding of the significance of the written work to their development as a professional psychotherapist is needed.
- 7.8.c** Some of the work reviewed bore little or no explicit relationship to psychotherapy or the practice of psychotherapy. This needs to be addressed throughout the training to ensure that, where earlier step off points create the reality that portions of the NCHP UKCP Training pathway are in themselves available to trainees as Hypnotherapy trainings, the integration of psychotherapeutic theory for those on the UKCP pathway is clearly embedded and ultimately evidenced through the written work.
- 7.8.d** The standard of presentation (layout, style, formatting) of some of the work also varied. Although potentially interpreted as merely pedantic, it is important for trainees to appreciate the value of presenting written work in a consistent and professional manner. Psychotherapy as a profession will have its own language and preferences for presentation of concepts and opinions; it is unhelpful to the profession as whole to offer the particular perspectives in a way that is either less than clear or which might appear inconsistent with expectations across academic and professional fields. The recognition of this and the habits need to be instilled within the qualifying trainings for the profession.

8. Conclusions: - Requirements, Recommendations and Guidance

8.1 The assessors conclusions are framed in terms of:

8.1.a Requirements: actions that the training organisation must take or issues that must be addressed. A timescale within which ameliorative action must be concluded in respect of each requirement will be specified. Effectively implementing actions to address requirements identified at QR is mandatory for UKCP membership to be maintained.

8.1.b Recommendations: recommendations will either be '*strong recommendations*' or '*recommendations*'. Strong Recommendations relate to areas of current development within UKCP / the UKCP Section that are likely to create a future requirement or are directly concerned with current thinking on best practice on important aspects of trainings. Recommendations will normally relate to UKCP's understanding of best practice across masters level trainings both within UKCP and across the postgraduate education sector. Indications of time limits may be given, where relevant. It is considered good practice for organisations to take reasonable steps to review and assess recommendations arising from QR assessments and to be able to demonstrate whether and how they have sought to address them at the next review.

8.1.c Advice and Guidance: is offered as feedback by assessors with the aim of supporting organisations to develop their trainings. This may relate to advice about possible ways of augmenting or enhancing the experience of trainees, preserving a special characteristic of a training, or developing the organisation as a whole, for example. Guidance is intended to support organisations in their continued development.

8.2 Requirements:

8.2.a Marking: NCHP needs to ensure that all assessed work through out the training pathway is double marked. Significant pieces of work that form part of the trainees' development but are not assessed as part of the progression through the training should be subjected to double consideration. **Time frame:** within 12 months

8.2.b Mental Health Placement: NCHP must develop criteria and guidance for including a mental health placement as a compulsory element in the UKCP training pathway. Such placements do not necessarily require that trainees practice within the placement, but should ensure that trainees have the opportunity to observe clients with a range of mental health presentations / needs and have access to a suitably qualified professional(s) from whom they can get information and guidance on mental health concerns and

approaches. **Time frame:** this should be implemented within 12 months

8.2.c Client group clarification: NCHP must ensure that all documentation and information relating to the training clearly identifies the training as an Adult Psychotherapy training. **Time scale:** This should be completed within 6 months of the date of this report.

8.2.d Supervision: NCHP must ensure that adjustments are made to make certain that trainees' accredited supervised practice is supervised in a manner that avoids inappropriate cross over from trainers, where the trainer has a major input to the programme. There should be clear learning outcomes for trainees from their supervision that can be addressed by supervisee and supervisor. This should be implemented within the next **6 months** from the date of this report

8.2.e Trainee Feedback forms: NCHP must review and revise these forms and the procedures relating to their use to extend their scope and allow a more transparent route for trainees to offer and receive clear feedback in relation to their development through the course of the training. **Time scale:** revised forms and procedures for feedback in both directions should be provided to the assessors within 12 months.

8.2.f Submission Format for assessed work: NCHP has very good guidance for trainees on many aspects of written work. NCHP should revise this to include a clear requirement that only typed / word processed work can be accepted and that electronic copies of work should be provided at the time of submission of printed copies. **Time scale:** changes to documents should be made within 6 months, policy should demonstrably be in place / applied to all trainees within 12 months. Revised documents to be provided to assessors, implementation to be assessed at next QR.

8.2.g External Examiner: NCHP must develop clear criteria for the appointment of their external examiner, which should include a job description, person specification and appointment process. This document should incorporate information about the term of each appointment and the standards of practice required during appointment. Grounds and procedures for termination should either be incorporated or clearly identified / cross referenced in other documentation. This measure will support NCHP is providing a transparent and accountable relationship with the External examiner; act as evidence of the organisations commitment to equalities and implementation of their policy; serve to protect the organisation against claims of unfair practice or discrimination. **N.B.** It would be usual for the External Examiner's role to have a

maximum tenure of 5 years. **Time frame:** This should be in place within 6 months

8.3 **Recommendations:**

8.3.a Update Dissertation Scope: NCHP should review the final dissertation guidance and preparation for trainees to ensure that dissertations contain clear critical analysis of the therapeutic framework in which NCHP has trained them (Hypno-Psychotherapy). Critical Analysis should be reflectively and reflexively cross referenced to trainees' practice. **NB: This is a strong recommendation. It would be desirable for evidence of this development to be available at the next review.**

8.3.b Final Dissertation: It is a **strong recommendation** that the final dissertation should include an exploration of the individual trainee's psychotherapeutic framework and philosophy demonstrating a masters level of psychotherapeutic understanding and exploration including cross-referencing to other approaches at a psychotherapeutic level. **NB: This is a strong recommendation. It would be desirable for evidence of this development to be available at the next review.**

8.3.c Marking Criteria: Marking criteria for each aspect of assessed work should be described on the marking pro forma. Full guidance on criteria for each aspect and each marking band should be available in the trainee handbook.

8.3.d Interview record sheets: NCHP is advised to review the record sheets from entry interviews for prospective trainees to ensure that they provide an adequate framework to support interviewers in assuring reasonable consistency across interviews of all applicants and to support NCHP in effectively evidencing their application of admission criteria and diversity and equal opportunities policy

8.3.e External Moderator: Although the role of external moderator is not currently a requirement of the Hypno-Pschotherapy Section, it is recognised as best practice and is a requirement across the majority of UKCP modalities. It is very likely that this will become a core UKCP requirement at the next revision of UKCP's Standards of Education and Training, which is under way. The assessors therefore **strongly recommend** that NCHP produce criteria and appointment procedures (see 8.2.g) for the position of External Moderator and seek to appoint someone to this role. Time scale: The documentation should be finalised within 12 months and copies provided to the assessors. NCHP should have appointed an External Moderator within 18 months. Implementation will be assessed at the next QR. It should be noted that introducing the purpose of this role to trainee information sources and to the trainee

group conceptually is an integral part of its implementation. **N.B.** It would be usual for the External Moderator role to have a maximum tenure of 7 years.

8.4 Guidance:

8.4.a Distance Learning / Self Directed Learning Infrastructures:

NCHP has well developed documentation and systems to support trainees in their distance and self-directed learning. In the assessors' view they were at the forefront of examples seen in the area within UKCP. While there is undoubtedly much for the centre and other Sections and MOs to learn from NCHP's experience and practice in this area, the trainees reported that they would enjoy / appreciate some further opportunities to be supported in both meeting to brainstorm ideas for their dissertations (which might form part of a new weekend in the latter stages of the training, thereby also acting to maintain support and contact during that period) and also to establish and manage forums and study group communications. The group of trainees at the assessment were proactive, technically competent and had taken steps to establish such arrangements independently. This may not always be the case and offering guidance and practical facilities (the assessors noted the intention to further develop on-line forums and facilities for trainees and trainers) would strengthen NCHP's infrastructure and evidence base for the rigour of the distance and independent learning aspects of the training.

8.5 **Conclusion: Pass, Defer, or Fail**

8.5.a Each QR process carries both the intention to assure quality within and across sections and at the level of UKCP standards generally. QR's are intended to offer constructive feedback and an external perspective that may be of assistance to organisations in their development and maintenance of high standards.

8.5.b Inevitably there is also a quality control aspect to the process. This means that assessors must also arrive at a decision in relation to whether an organisation continues to meet UKCP and relevant modality standards for the training it delivers. In particular assessors must consider whether the training as assessed is capable of ensuring that graduates are fit to practice as psychotherapists and therefore to be placed on the UKCP's National Register.

8.5.c There are 3 possible outcomes from a QR visit:

(A) **Pass:** The organisation continues to meet UKCP and relevant modality standards to an acceptable level. 'Passed' organisations may be given recommendations and guidance. Where an organisation is determined to have 'Passed' with requirements this will be made clear. Organisations passed are unlikely to have been assessed as having either a large number of specific requirements or any requirements that relate to significant issues of concern

(B) **Defer:** the organisation meets many of the criteria and standards of the UKCP and relevant modality, but does not meet either significant criteria / standards or a sufficient number of other criteria / standards so as to create a basis for the assessors to defer the conclusion of the QR process. To award a deferral assessors must also consider that there is scope for the organisation to be returned to a position of being able to achieve a pass within a reasonable time frame (usually not more than 18 months). Where the issues of concern identified by assessors relate to the potential fitness to practice of trainees / graduates assessors may define limits on the organisation in terms of putting graduates forward for registration until relevant remedial actions have been completed, evidenced and where relevant reassessed.

(C) **Fail:** the organisation does not meet a number of significant core and modality criteria and standards. Normally assessors must consider that the organisation is unlikely to be able to complete adequate corrective action to address the identified issues within a reasonable time frame to fail an organisation. An organisation may also be failed if assessors consider this the only appropriate means of securing public and trainees safety and preserving the UKCP's standards and reputation.

Decision:

Pass: On the basis that NCHP was seen to be meeting UKCP's core Standards for Education and Training, as well as those in place for the Hypno-Psychotherapy Section at the point of this assessment, the assessors consider that NCHP has passed the Quinquennial Review assessment. In arriving at this decision the assessors have also considered the relevant standards for the EAP EWAO for the modality.

This is conditional on their completion of the required actions within the specified time scales and clear evidencing of having given appropriate attention to recommendations.