



Bond University - APAC Accreditation Assessment Summary Report

Higher education provider	Bond University
Name of the Psychology AOU	School of Psychology
Standards version	Version 1.2, 1 January 2019
Purpose of assessment	Follow up site visit from an out of cycle assessment of a new program
Programs and level of study assessed	Master of Professional Psychology (Level 3)
Campus	Gold Coast
Date of site visit	October 2019
APAC Board determination date	17 December 2019
Accreditation start date	17 December 2019



Background and overview

This is a report of an Australian Psychology Accreditation Council (APAC) accreditation assessment made following an application by Bond University for accreditation of its Master of Professional Psychology program. An initial on-paper out-of-cycle assessment was made in 2018.

During the course of the visit meetings were held with the Dean of the Faculty of Society and Design, Professor Derek Carson, the Head of School, Associate Professor Bruce Watt, the Course Coordinator, the Psychology Program Administrator, teaching staff, the Clinic Director, an external supervisor and current Master of Professional Psychology (MPP) students. The assessment team also inspected the Psychology Clinic, and further relevant documentation.

The findings in this report are based on the documentation provided and information gained from the meetings during the site visit.



Key findings

The Master of Professional Psychology program was offered for the first time in May 2019 and has a current enrolment of four students. The course consists of five compulsory coursework units, which are shared with the Master of Psychology (Clinical) (MPC) program, one elective unit and a placement in the Psychology Clinic. The placement is 180 hours and during it, the students are provided with 1 hour of supervision per 7.5 placement hours. In the semester prior to the clinic placement, at least 120 hours of skills training is apparently provided in the coursework units. No formal supervision is provided for this skills training although some feedback is provided to students by the unit lecturer. However, given that the units are shared with the MPC, the classes are relatively large and there is very little individual feedback.

Despite the problem related to the placement/skills training and a few other minor issues mentioned below, the basic structure of the program appears to be satisfactory. The staff delivering the program are obviously committed to it and are attempting to give the students a good learning experience. Similarly, the feedback from the external supervisor, the clinic director and the students were generally very positive.

As the students have only completed about four weeks of their placement, it was not possible to obtain comprehensive evidence relating to some standards.



APAC Board determination

That Bond University's **Master of Professional Psychology** (Level 3) (Campus: Gold Coast) program is re-accredited from **17 December 2019** until **31 December 2021**.

Subject to the following conditions:

By **31 January 2020**:

1. To ensure that Standard 1 Public safety, criteria 1.7, 1.9 and 1.10 are met, the School must submit copies of completed logbooks to APAC for students from the 2019 cohort, showing that they attained their direct client hours, client related hours and supervision hours appropriately.

By **30 June 2020**:

2. To ensure that Standard 1 Public safety, criterion 1.7, and Standard 3 Program of study, criterion 3.3 are met, the School is to provide APAC evidence that the staff member teaching professional issues and ethics is appropriately qualified and experienced to teach those topics.
3. To ensure that Standard 1 Public safety, criteria 1.9 and 1.10, Standard 3 Program of study, criterion 3.7 and Standard 5 Assessment, criterion 5.4 are met, the School is to provide APAC evidence that:
 - i. the skills training counting towards the practical placement hours occurs within the context of a practical placement,
 - ii. there is appropriate supervision of skills training, and
 - iii. the placement/s are of sufficient duration to meet the requirements of the Standards.
4. To ensure that Standard 3 Program of study, criteria 3.2, 3.8 and 3.9, and Standard 5 Assessment, criteria 5.1 and 5.2 are met, the School is to provide APAC evidence that the unit materials and outlines are revised to ensure that
 - i. content on cultural responsiveness and the principles of interprofessional learning and practice are covered,
 - ii. program learning outcomes incorporate all graduate competencies and
 - iii. all program learning outcomes and graduate competencies are appropriately assessed.



Table 1: Summary of findings regarding each criterion for each Standard

Domain 1: Public safety	Standard Statement 1: Public safety is assured
	Level 3 Standard is substantially met
Domain 2: Academic governance and quality assurance	Standard Statement 2: Academic governance and quality assurance processes are effective
	Level 3 Standard is met
Domain 3: Program of study	Standard Statement 3: Program of study, design, delivery and resourcing enable students to achieve the required graduate competencies
	Level 3 Standard is substantially met
Domain 4: The student experience	Standard Statement 4: Students are provided with equitable and timely access to information and support
	Level 3 Standard is met
Domain 5: Assessment	Standard Statement 5: Assessment is fair, reliable and valid
	Level 3 Standard is substantially met



Commendations

A commendation refers to a particularly significant achievement by the education provider with regard to the program.

The Assessment Team have made the subsequent commendations following the evaluation of the program.

- The School of Psychology at Bond University is commended on their enthusiasm for the program and their commitment to giving the students a positive and supportive learning experience.
- The Head and staff of the School of Psychology are commended on the speed with which they have addressed some of the issues raised during the course of the visit.



Suggestion

It is strongly recommended that the systematic review research project be marked by two examiners with one being a content expert. This approach would be consistent with the practice of having two examiners for postgraduate research projects.