

NRHP QR Assessment Visit Report

1. Visit Information

1.1. Organisation Being Assessed

National Register of Hypnotherapists and Psychotherapists (NRHP)

1.2. UKCP Member Organisation Type

NRHP is a UKCP Listing Organisation.

1.3. Date of Assessment Visit

Saturday 29 March 2014

1.4. Location of Assessment

The visit took place at the NRHP offices at 18 Carr Road, Nelson, Lancashire, BB9 7JS.

1.5. Administrative Address of Organisation (if different)

As above.

1.6. Assessment Team

The assessment team consisted of:

- Alan McConnon (Quality Assurance and Regulation Manager, UKCP)
- Paul Atkinson (Council for Psychoanalysis and Jungian Analysis)
- Mike Shallcross (Hypno-Psychotherapy College)

1.7. NRHP Representatives

Present at the assessment visit were:

- (representing the Board) Jane Watson, John Hoyle-Wood, John Pilling
- (representing the Ethics Committee) Peter Adamson, Leslie Williams
- (representing ordinary members) Paul Monahan, Sue Washington
- (NRHP staff members) Julie Young, Susan Dixon

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?)

NRHP is a UKCP Listing Organisation. Listing Organisations function within the UKCP Framework to allow individual registrants to maintain their UKCP registration through an organisation other than the UKCP Training Organisation or Accrediting Organisation that first placed them on the Register. Although Listing Organisations are not entitled to put forward individuals for first registration, they have duties, responsibilities and operational functions in common with all of the Full Categories of UKCP Membership in terms of re-registering and periodic reaccreditation of their members.

Listing Organisations are therefore involved with the application of UKCP Core and Modality Section Standards for Education and Training, Ethics, Supervision and CPD. Listing Organisations are expected to have, operate (and evidence that operation) and develop effective procedures and practices to ensure that their UKCP Registrants continue to be fit to practise.

2.1. Management and Governance

2.1.1. Board of Directors

NRHP has a Board consisting of the following:

- Jane F Watson (Chair)
- John Hoyle-Wood
- John Pilling

It was noted that Leslie Williams had recently resigned from the Board, leaving only three Board members, of whom Jane Watson is the only one who is UKCP registered. This is consistent with NRHP's Articles of Association, which do not specify any minimum number of Directors (paragraph 34).

2.1.2. Constitution

The NRHP's constitutional documents, including the Memorandum and Articles of Association, had been made available to the assessors prior to the visit. These documents clearly structure NRHP as a not-for-profit organisation, and were considered relatively straight forward, uncontentious and essentially fit for purpose for a UKCP Member Organisation.

2.2. Day-to-day management

2.2.1. Administration

The day-to-day management and administration of NRHP is handled by two part-time staff: Julie Young and Susan Dixon. NRHP started in 1985, and Julie has been with the organisation since January 1989, and Susan since May 1996. They were also involved in administration for NCHP, which shared administrative space with NRHP until shortly before the previous QR.

3. Discussions with Members

3.1. Board members

3.1.1. Organisational culture

The Board members explained that it has been difficult for NRHP to attract new members, because the organisation has traditionally only accepted people who have done UKCP-level training, and these people tend to stay with their TO rather than joining NRHP.

It was acknowledged that it would be possible for NRHP to create additional categories of membership for non-UKCP-qualified people. However, at the moment the organisation is choosing to look after its existing members rather than focusing on attracting new

members. The ethos of the organisation is democratic, and there is no desire for “dynamic” new leadership.

Although there are only 3-4 members on the Board, other members help out with various specific events or activities. The main event each year is the AGM, now held at the Crewe Arms Hotel to facilitate travel from all parts of the country. The event (including lunch) is free of charge, and the attendance is usually around 40 members.

3.1.2. Re-accreditation

Re-accreditation of members is essentially an administrative process, handled by Julie and Susan, and leading to award of a certificate. Julie and Susan will contact Jane if they have any specific questions, for instance about the relevance of a particular CPD course, but it was acknowledged that it would be good to have an “idiot’s guide” to the process.

Board members said that they have tried to keep down the cost of re-accreditation, and they were willing to charge only £100, but this was disallowed by the College. They said that very few clients come to them specifically looking for UKCP-registered members, and very few members work in the NHS.

3.1.3. External moderator

It was noted that there is currently no external assessor/moderator. Board members said that this was for reasons of cost; Board members themselves did not charge NRHP for their work, but an external assessor might wish to charge a high fee. They said they would seek the views of members about this at the AGM.

3.1.4. Diversity and equalities

Board members said that they are happy to accept any new members who apply to join and are suitably qualified, but because they are not actively seeking new members, they have no control over the diversity of new applicants. They currently have a few Asian female members, and probably fairly equal numbers of male and female members, though precise statistics were not available. They have a diversity statement among their policies.

They said that in other respects their members are quite diverse, with very varied levels of academic attainment and financial means, and in locations spread across the country. The Board try to ensure accessibility (as already noted) by keeping costs down and by holding the AGM in a central location.

For the same reason they have resisted proposals that all members should have a supervisor from within the College. They encourage members to belong to local peer supervision groups, and the office can provide details of other members in the same area.

3.2. Ethics Committee members

3.2.1. Ethics Committee process

The Ethics Committee members explained that the Committee is called together by the Chair when needed. This happens quite infrequently, probably about once a year; the last time was for a complaint against a non-UKCP member. The Committee aims to get input from both sides in order to reach a balanced conclusion.

They said that Julie is the front line for dealing with any problems, and she will always attempt to resolve matters informally. On the Committee itself there is currently no lay representation, though at the last meeting they involved a non-UKCP member who is a Church of England vicar and connected with Social Services.

3.2.2. UKCP Complaints Process

It was agreed that the NRHP Complaints Procedure needs to be adjusted to make clear the route to be followed for UKCP members via the CCP, and also that the CCP should be referred to in the Code of Ethics and Clinical Practice.

3.3. *Ordinary members*

3.3.1. Support from NRHP office

Both ordinary members said that they were very happy with the way NRHP is run, and they had found the office (Julie and Susan) very helpful and supportive. They said that Julie and Susan support members through the re-accreditation process, and check that all the paperwork is in order; they are now also encouraging UKCP-registered members to keep CPD records with headings matching UKCP requirements. They can also assist with one-off queries, e.g. about house insurance for therapy.

One member said that she has sometimes had clients find her because she is UKCP-registered.

3.4. *Staff members*

3.4.1. General administration

Julie and Susan said that the organisation works well in its current form. They can answer most queries themselves, and for others they can email members who will be able to provide answers. They still get a few enquiries about referrals, but these days most people just look on the website.

3.4.2. Re-accreditation

They noted that the NRHP requirement for CPD is 150 hours over five years, but for UKCP members it is 250 hours. Julie checks that members meet this requirement, and lets them know if not. The letters they send out in regard to re-accreditation are individually tailored for each person.

3.4.3. Complaints

They had not had any complaints about UKCP members. Most complaints were dealt with informally and did not go any further; for instance there had been one which was from years back, and another about someone who was not a member of NRHP at the time of the event.

Julie makes a note of concerns that don't go any further, but she does not formally report these to anyone. She agreed this might be worth considering, in case there are common themes which could be addressed.

4. Conclusions

4.1. Requirements, recommendations and guidance

The assessors' conclusions are framed in terms of:

- **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.
- **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 organisations within the regulatory 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.
- **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 an organisation, or developing the organisation as a whole, for example. Guidance is intended to support member organisations in their continued development.

4.2. Requirements

4.2.1. UKCP Complaints Process

The NRHP Complaints Procedure needs to be adjusted to make clear the route to be followed for UKCP members via the CCP, and also the CCP should be referred to in the Code of Ethics and Clinical Practice.

4.3. Recommendations

4.3.1. External moderator

It is recommended that NRHP give consideration to appointing an External Moderator to provide advice, guidance and support to the organisation and thus its members on the development and growth of the organisation.

It is recognised that there are concerns about cost, and that this consideration (and the views of members at the AGM) will need to be taken into account.

4.3.2. Lay membership of Ethics Committee

It is recommended that NRHP consider either appointing an appropriate individual (such as the person referred to earlier) as a full member of the Ethics Committee, or amending the terms of reference of the Committee to require involvement of a suitable lay person in all cases.

4.4. Guidance

4.4.1. Guide to re-accreditation

It is suggested that it would be helpful for NRHP members to have available a simple and clear guide to the process of re-accreditation, setting out the various requirements and the steps in the process.

4.4.2. Complaints recording

It is suggested that a procedure be set up so that all informal complaints are recorded in such a way that consideration can be given to appropriate action, even if the individual complaints are not progressed any further.

4.5. Overall conclusion

Despite the points noted above, the overall conclusion of the assessment team was that NRHP is generally well run and meets the requirements of both UKCP and its members.