The British Association of Sport and Exercise Sciences
Sport and Exercise Psychology Accreditation Route

SEPAR Development Project Summary Report

August 2023

Contents

Acknowledgements	3
Background	4
Aims of Development Project	4
Methods	5
Survey & Focus Group Findings (You Said, We Did)	7
Summary of Changes	10
Annex 1 – list of SEPAR documentation	17

Acknowledgements

SEPAR Development Consultant	Paula Watson, SEPAR-AG Supervisor Representative
SEPAR Development Working Group	Jane Gillott, BASES Professional Standards Administrator Chris Harwood, SEPAR-AG Reviewer Representative Misia Gervis, SEPAR-AG Supervisor Representative Nichola Kentzer, SEPAR-AG Supervisor and Reviewer Training Representative Hayley McEwan, SEPAR-AG Supervisor and Reviewer Training Representative Lisa Phillips, BASES Professional Development Manager Rob Morris, SEPAR-AG Chair Chris Marshall, SEPAR-AG Reviewer Representative

We wish to thank BASES for financially supporting this work, and SEPAR candidates, supervisors and reviewers who gave up their time to complete either the survey and/or attend a focus group to share their views, which have been instrumental in determining the changes that have been made to the SEPAR.

Background

The BASES Sport and Exercise Psychology Accreditation Route (SEPAR) has now been open over three years (first candidates enrolled February 2020). During this time, we have seen immense growth, with 114 candidates enrolled as at January 2023, plus 66 supervisors and 52 reviewers engaged with the programme (the majority of whom do both roles). With this has come an increased need for communication, standardisation, and education, to ensure consistency and quality of service provision.

Through ongoing reflections in the SEPAR Advisory Group (SEPAR-AG), we were able to pinpoint several areas that required attention to ensure we maintain the excellent standards we aspire to. To carry out this work in a timely manner, it was considered a need for a consultant to lead a bespoke SEPAR development project, which ran between January and July 2023. This report outlines the work done during that development project, how we ensured the SEPAR community's views were reflected, and what we changed as a result.

Aims of Development Project

Aim

To review existing processes in order to develop clear, comprehensive, and up-to date guidance for portfolio submission and assessment, to ensure consistency of standards across all supervisors, reviewers, and candidates. This will involve consolidating learning from the first three years of SEPAR and addressing mounting problems such as increasing numbers of extensions, supervisors not signing off material, incomplete or challenging-to-navigate submissions, and inconsistency in reviewing.

Objectives

1. Develop specific guidance to assist supervisors and candidates in preparing portfolios, plus any additional forms needed.

2. Develop specific guidance to assist reviewers when reviewing portfolios, plus any additional forms needed.

3. Review and clarify clear parameters for submission of portfolios, extension requests, and what happens if insufficient information is submitted.

4. Review and streamline SEPAR templates and incorporate these clearly into portfolio preparation guidance (objectives 1 & 2).

5. Explore mechanisms to improve supervisor and reviewer networking / ongoing support.

6. Establish clear protocols to action any outstanding original programme commitments and tasks we are bound to in the HCPC review, including clarifying who holds responsibility for each process.

7. Review and clarify roles and expectations of SEPAR Advisory Group members, drawing on the Terms of Reference for BASES committees as a guide.

8. Clarify mechanisms for supervisors and reviewers to feed back into the SEPAR process.

9. Develop a SEPAR conflict of interest protocol, to cover instances where a potential conflict develops via external relationships between candidates, supervisors and reviewers.

10. Work with the SEPAR-AG Supervisor and Reviewer Training Reps to ensure a coordinated approach to supervisor and reviewer training, and to ensure the portfolio guidance (developed in objectives 1-2) is aligned with pre-SEPAR and other mandatory training materials (also to clarify where content from objectives 1 & 2 best sits).

11. Update candidate, qualification, supervisor and reviewer handbooks to reflect the work completed in objectives 1 to 10.

12. Agree protocols for communicating all guidance/updates with the SEPAR community, both for new candidates/supervisors/reviewers, and as ongoing training.

13. Produce brief report to summarise the activity from the consultancy.

Methods

Community consultation

During February 2023, an online survey was sent out to all current SEPAR supervisors, all current SEPAR reviewers and all current SEPAR candidates who had completed at least one portfolio submission. Candidates, supervisors and reviewers were also given the opportunity to attend a focus group to share their views in person (separate focus groups for candidates, and for supervisors/reviewers).

It was clear from survey responses that individuals gave substantial time to think through their experiences and submit meaningful feedback. Candidates mostly spent in the region of 10-30 minutes on their survey, and supervisors/reviewers in the region of 30-35 minutes.

Candidate surveys and focus groups. Candidates were asked to provide qualitative comments on their experiences of portfolio preparation, assigning competency ratings, providing evidence, putting together their action plan, writing reflections, writing case studies, and producing their introductory video. They were asked to comment on what they thought worked well, any challenges or things they were unclear about, and any improvements they thought we could make to enhance the portfolio preparation process for candidates. Candidates were also asked whether they had ever sought extensions and their reasons for this, as well as questions about the technical aspects of portfolio preparation and submission (e.g., Excel competencies spreadsheet, One Drive folder, SEPAR templates). Finally, they were asked to comment on guidance from BASES, supervisors and on the helpfulness of reviewer feedback.

31 candidates completed the survey in full, 2 of whom also attended the focus group. There were also 17 incomplete responses where data was provided in the "about you" section but no further questions were answered.

Of the 31 candidates who completed the survey, 11 had completed their mid-point submission (1 of whom had also completed their final submission). 22 candidates were on the sport and exercise pathway, 8 on the sport psychology only pathway, and 1 on the exercise psychology only pathway. 13 candidates were on the 2-year pathway, 13 on the 3-year pathway, and 5 on the 4-year pathway.

Supervisor/reviewer surveys and focus groups. Supervisors/reviewers were asked to provide qualitative comments on the same portfolio-related aspects as candidates (see above), as well as being asked questions about their interpretation of specific SEPAR completion criteria (e.g., 2700 hours application/consulting, 275 hours CPD and supervision, 225 dissemination and citizenship, 20 hours observation, 50 backdated application/consultancy hours etc.). Reviewers were also asked about their perceptions of reviewer roles, their familiarity with the re-submission guidance and challenges in meeting the review deadlines. Finally, both were asked about their willingness to take part in various CPD and training activities (e.g., e-learning videos, networking meetings, online workshops).

19 full survey responses were received, and 3 supervisors/reviewers attended a focus group (not all of whom had completed the survey). There were also 3 partially completed survey responses with some usable data, plus 7 incomplete responses where data was provided in the "about you" section but no further questions were answered.

Of the 19 fully completed responses, 12 respondents had both supervised and reviewed for the SEPAR, 4 had only reviewed for the SEPAR, and 3 had only supervised for the SEPAR. For supervisors, number of current supervisions ranged from 0 to 6 candidates (although one of the incomplete responses noted they were currently supervising 18 candidates).

Working group meetings

SEPAR Development Working Group meetings (see page 3 for membership of this group) were held on 3, 14, 21 and 30 March 2023 with review meetings on 5 June and 19 July 2023. The meetings on 30 March and 19 July included all members of the wider SEPAR Advisory Group, thus ensuring there were opportunities for candidate representatives, alumni representatives and external examiners to feed into the development of the guidance. A separate meeting was also held with external examiners on 24 May to discuss their specific thoughts on the proposals.

Each working group meeting was 2 hours in duration and had a specific focus (e.g., portfolio guidance, quality assuring the review process, training and support for supervisors/reviewers). Meetings provided an opportunity to review survey / focus group responses from candidates, supervisors and reviewers on each respective area, then discuss potential ways forward until a consensus was reached.

Putting together the new guidance

The SEPAR Development Consultant was responsible for collating data from the surveys and focus groups, chairing the working group meetings, then taking forward the actions agreed to draft new documentation for SEPAR. As drafts were developed, these were reviewed by SEPAR Development Working Group members, both over e-mail and during meetings. This ensured the process was thorough and the guidance was developed iteratively with ongoing input from group members.

Survey and Focus Group Findings (You Said, We Did)

This section offers a brief summary of the findings from the SEPAR community surveys and focus groups (collectively referred to as the “community consultation”). Table 1 (page 9) then outlines how we drew upon SEPAR candidate, supervisor and reviewer views to directly inform changes to the SEPAR programme.

In accordance with data protection regulations, we have not included verbatim quotes within this section, since the data were provided for the purpose of informing changes to SEPAR and consent was not sought to include quotes in an open-access summary report.

Areas of satisfaction

Findings from the community consultation indicated SEPAR candidates, supervisors and reviewers were generally positive about the SEPAR programme. It was recognised the SEPAR is a new programme and with this naturally comes teething challenges. Respondents were however sympathetic to the efforts that had gone into developing the SEPAR and were complementary about many aspects of the pathway. In particular, respondents appreciated the portfolio submission process, they noted the candidate handbook is particularly useful (94% candidates reported regularly referring to this) and felt it is generally clear how to rate competencies. Respondents noted specifically how efficient and helpful the BASES Professional Standards Administrator is in responding to SEPAR queries, and in the operational management of the SEPAR. In terms of portfolio submission, existing guidance from BASES and from supervisors was generally perceived to be adequate or good, although a very small number of candidates reported guidance to be poor.

Areas of ambiguity

There were a number of areas where guidance in current handbooks was believed to be ambiguous. As such, supervisors and reviewers reported different interpretations of these and a need for further clarity was identified in several areas:

- How the 2700 application/consultancy hours should be calculated;
- Which activities count towards the 275 CPD hours, and whether reflection can be counted in these hours;
- What constitutes dissemination and citizenship and how candidates should calculate planning and reflection time within their 225 hours;
- What counted towards the 20 observation hours, and how these should be recorded;
- When new candidates could backdate 50 application/consulting hours from, and what type of activities they were allowed to backdate;
- Whether “supervisor comment” columns on logs were mandatory or optional;

Areas for development

Findings from the community consultation indicated several strong areas of consensus in terms of areas for development for SEPAR. These were common across candidates, supervisors and reviewers, albeit each approached the issues from a different perspective.

The key issues included (see Table 1 for how each of these areas have been addressed):

- A lack of parity in reviewer feedback, with a feeling from candidates that it was "luck of the draw" how strict your reviewer would be. Candidates and supervisors described instances where portfolios appeared to be comparable in nature, yet one pair of reviewers might be complementary and constructive, whereas another pair might be strict and derogatory. Similarly, there was inconsistency in how portfolios that did not meet the required standards were managed, and a need for clearer re-submission criteria and protocols.
- Inconsistency in advice provided by supervisors/reviewers. Candidates described feeling frustrated when they were advised to present their portfolio one way by their supervisor, only to have their reviewers ask them to re-structure everything and submit it another way.
- A need for clearer guidance and examples for how to present portfolios. In light of the two points above, there was a strong call from the community for clearer portfolio guidance and provision of examples that would encourage a more standardised submission and review process. Such guidance should include specific details about what "counts" as evidence and how to clearly signpost reviewers to this.
- A need to ensure the SEPAR community are aware of all the documentation they need to read, and where to find this. For example, 19% of candidates and 33% of supervisors reported never having looked at the Practice Placement Handbook. The working group also noted that guidance for reviewers was limited and there was a need to develop a specific Reviewer Handbook.
- Issues with the current Excel competencies spreadsheet. Technical problems included challenges in hyperlinking to evidence, and difficulties expanding, writing in, and reading information in cells. Reviewers noted candidate action plans often lacked specificity, and candidates reported seeing the action plan column as a "tick box" activity with little value for their learning experience.
- A feeling that the volume of individual reflections required (especially for the knowledge competencies) was excessive. This was challenging for reviewers to manage, and candidates reported these as a "tick box" activity, rather than the meaningful learning experience they were intended to provide.

Table 1 – You Said, We Did. Summary of actions taken to address the views raised by SEPAR candidates, supervisors and reviewers in the surveys and focus groups completed during February 2023.

Point raised by SEPAR community	Action taken
Clearer guidance needed to help candidates present portfolios in a way that evidences their development and is easy for reviewers to navigate	• Developed 1.5 hour SEPAR Portfolio Guidance video, including examples of how to complete SEPAR templates and how to lay out One Drive. • Updated SEPAR Candidate Handbook throughout to ensure it is clear how to rate competencies. • Updated SEPAR templates and incorporated these into the guidance, so it is clear how these should be used and what needs to be submitted at each time-point. • Offer a monthly drop-in between August 2023 and June 2024 to support candidates, supervisors and reviewers with the new guidance.
Easier to find handbooks and documentation	• Updated SEPAR webpages so the new SEPAR guidance and all handbooks are easy to locate. The handbooks that candidates, supervisors and reviewers each need to read are referred to in the SEPAR Portfolio Guidance Video, and again at the front of each respective handbook – therefore reducing the chances that anyone can miss these.
Need to improve parity across supervisors and reviewers	• Upskill all current supervisors and reviewers through making it mandatory to watch 1.5 hour SEPAR Portfolio Guidance video and to attend an online workshop outlining the key changes to the SEPAR. • Include 1.5 hour SEPAR Portfolio Guidance video as a mandatory part of new supervisor and reviewer training. • Updated SEPAR Supervisor Handbook to ensure supervisor roles in the portfolio preparation and submission process are clear. • Created a new SEPAR Reviewer Handbook to standardise approaches to reviewing.
More user-friendly competency profile and action plan	• Created more user-friendly competency profiles for knowledge, skills, self-development and management and experience (using Microsoft Word to enable easier hyperlinking). • Removed the action plan from the competency profile, and created a separate SEPAR Action Plan, designed to be more meaningful for candidate development and more informative for reviewers.
Remove ambiguity around hours calculations, observations, backdated hours etc.	• Added more specific details in the SEPAR Candidate Handbook, and the SEPAR Qualification Handbook to remove ambiguity and clarify the requirements of the SEPAR. • Changed the requirement for supervisor observations to put the focus on ongoing, meaningful observation in a range of contexts, rather than meeting X number of hours. This process emphasises formative candidate development and assessment of fitness to practice, and reduces the risk of observations being seen as a “tick box requirement” for SEPAR.
More meaningful way to evidence knowledge competencies	• Changed the way knowledge competencies are evidenced to make this more meaningful for candidates, and more informative for reviewers. Rather than reliance on single reflections only, this allows candidates to write deeper, more critical “themed reflections”, as well as supporting portfolios with other forms of evidence such as certificates of course completion or candidate-developed workshop slides.
Clearer guidance around the review process and re-submission criteria	• Updated the SEPAR Qualification Handbook so the criteria and processes for re-submission are clear at each time-point (including the implications for candidates should they be asked to re-submit). Flow-charts have been added to the SEPAR Qualification Handbook Annex to illustrate this visually.

Summary of Changes

This consultancy project resulted in extensive improvements being made to the SEPAR programme. In addition to the changes made in direct response to the community consultation (captured in Table 1 above), further changes were instigated by discussions that arose during the SEPAR Development Working Group meetings.

As a means of trying to create a usable catalogue of these improvements, Tables 2 to 6 summarise the changes made in respect to SEPAR candidate documentation, SEPAR completion criteria, SEPAR competency development and ratings, SEPAR supervisor roles and responsibilities, and SEPAR reviewer roles and responsibilities. In each table, the first two columns outline the nature of the change, the final column signposts readers to where they can find more detailed information about this change.

Table 2. Changes to SEPAR candidate documentation[1]

Change made	Description / main changes	Where can this be found
New SEPAR Portfolio Guidance video	Mandatory guidance for candidates, supervisors and reviewers on the development, presentation and submission of portfolios.	All documentation can be found on the SEPAR webpage
Updated SEPAR Candidate Handbook	Updated throughout to reflect changes made through the development project. This should be the key source of information for candidates, supervisors and reviewers around competency development and ratings. Notable areas where further detail has been added include: ○ More detailed information about SEPAR completion criteria (Section 2) ○ Additional guidance on developing and submitting portfolios (Section 2.1.4) ○ New note on client confidentiality (Section 3.0) ○ Outline of the SEPAR as a holistic process (Section 3.1) ○ More detailed guidance on reflective practice during the SEPAR (Section 3.2) ○ New guidance on rating knowledge competencies (Section 3.4) ○ Notes on how “contexts” should be interpreted for skills and self-development and management competencies (Tables 4 and 5) ○ Guidance on backdating up to 50 hours at start of the SEPAR (Section 3.7.1)	

[1] It was not within the remit of this development project to make any changes to APEC documentation. It is however noted that many of the changes cited in this section will also be relevant for SEPAR APEC candidates.

Change made	Description / main changes	Where can this be found
	○ Updates to some problematic competencies (Table 7, Annexes A to D) – see Table 3 in this document for specific details of which competencies have been updated	
Updated SEPAR Qualifications Handbook	Updated to reflect changes made through the development project. Notable areas where further detail has been added include: ○ Choosing the SEPAR duration and the SEPAR pathway (Section 2) ○ Review and resubmission criteria for each time-point (Section 2.7, and Annexes F-J) ○ Conflict of interest protocol (Section 2.10.1 and Annex K) ○ Updated information about extending, interrupting, withdrawing and re-enrolling with the SEPAR (Section 2.11)	
New submission checklists	• Now on Word documents, separate checklists for each submission point (including a column to check off the documents that need to be signed by the supervisor).	
Updated SEPAR Competency Profiles	• Now on Word documents, with separate versions for knowledge, skills, self-development and management and experience for initial, mid-point and final submissions. • Space for mid-point and final candidates to note their previous ratings • Competency descriptions included for ease of interpretation for candidates and reviewers • Descriptive boxes collapsed so narrative is provided across a whole theme (e.g., 1.2, 1.3) rather than per individual competencies (e.g., 1.2.1, 1.2.2).	
Updated SEPAR Logs X 6	• Now six logs, each has a front page that must be signed off by supervisor prior to submission: ○ Practice log ○ CPD and supervision log ○ Dissemination and citizenship log ○ Observation log ○ Core workshops log ○ *Backdated hours log (use only if applicable at initial submission)* • To prevent candidates being asked to reflect on the same event in multiple locations, detail required on the CPD/Supervision and Dissemination/Citizenship logs has been reduced, with clearer guidance on how to signpost to evidence elsewhere in the portfolio.	
New SEPAR Action Plan	• Now separate action plans on Word for candidates to complete (one for initial/mid-point, another for final submissions).	
New SEPAR Themed Reflection template	• Developed to guide candidates to be more critical in their reflection, and to draw on a range of CPD and applied experiences to reflect more deeply on a topic. Themed reflections are expected to form a key source of evidence within portfolios	
New SEPAR Therapeutic Risk	• Developed to encourage candidates to reflect on how risk might present and be assessed and managed in therapeutic situations. Relates specifically to competency 3.4.2 but should be encouraged for use throughout SEPAR.	

Change made	Description / main changes	Where can this be found
Assessment template		
Updated SEPAR Professional Philosophy Reflections	• Content updated in line with the content of the SEPAR Practice Philosophy workshop, and to reflect the fact most candidates submitting their initial portfolio will not yet have been on this workshop. Separate versions for initial, mid-point and final submissions.	
New SEPAR Quarterly Review Report	• Introduced to support candidates and supervisors with regular progress reviews in relation to SEPAR competencies. Now a mandatory part of the SEPAR process, and evidence must be submitted within mid-point and final portfolios.	

Table 3. SEPAR completion criteria

Change made	Description / main changes	Where can this be found
Clarification around 2700 application/consulting hours	• Clarification about what constitutes "contact hours" • Noted that planning and reflection time may differ for different activities • For each practice experience, candidates should record the <u>actual</u> amount of time spent in planning, contact and reflection on their practice log • New log should be started for each submission, but the cumulative total should be tallied on the front page	• Candidate handbook – section 2 • Practice log
Clarification around 275 CPD and supervision hours	• Changed to CPD and Supervision, to make clearer that supervision should be included within this • Clarification about what types of activities constitute CPD, with recommendations for how time is divided between these • Clarified that reflection time may be included within the 275 hours, *as long as* a reflection is submitted to evidence this • Clearer guidance around how to evidence different types of CPD • New log should be started for each submission, but the cumulative total should be tallied on the front page	• Candidate handbook – section 2 • Candidate handbook – section 3.4.2 - 3.4.5 (including Table 3) • CPD & supervision log
Clarification around 225 dissemination and citizenship hours	• Clarification about what constitutes dissemination and citizenship activities • Noted that occasionally these might overlap with application/consultancy, in which case they should be recorded on *one log only* • Clarified that planning time can be included within the 225 hours where appropriate • Clarified that reflection time may be included within the 225 hours, *as long as* a reflection is submitted to evidence this • New log should be started for each submission, but the cumulative total should be tallied on the front page	• Candidate handbook – section 2 • Dissemination & citizenship log
Clarification around 50 backdated hours	• Clarified that up to 50 hours may be backdated *prior to the date the SEPAR DBS check is received*	• Candidate handbook – section 3.7.1

	• Hours must have been completed post-MSc, supervised by a HCPC registered practitioner psychologist and can include planning, contact and reflection within the 50 hours	
Changes to observation requirements	• Clarified that observation is both formative and about assuring candidates' fitness to practise • Focus on observations in a range of contexts, must be *at least* 5 supervisor observations of candidate, 1 candidate observation of supervisor – important thing is that these are in varied situations • Encouraged to engage in continuous informal observations in applied situations • Flexibility in how observations are evidenced in the portfolio (observation form or audio/video), although there needs to be some evidence of the post-observation discussion and all must be recorded on the observation log • New log should be started for each submission, but the cumulative total should be tallied on the front page • Declaration added to the final supervisor report to confirm on the basis of observations they have undertaken that the candidate is fit to practise	• Candidate handbook – section 2 • Observation log • Supervisor report form – final submission
Clarity around core workshop completion timescales	• All core workshops must be completed before submitting the mid-point portfolio • Candidates should complete their core workshops log as they go along (submit the same log each time, just update the front page)	• Candidate handbook – section 2 • Core workshop log
Guidance on failure to meet standards	• Guidance added for cases of serious misconduct or if a candidate consistently fails to meet the SEPAR standards, where exclusion or withdrawal may need to be considered.	• Qualification handbook – section 2.7.6 • Reviewer handbook – section 4.4.2

Table 4. SEPAR competency development and ratings

Change made	Description / main changes	Where can this be found
Change to how knowledge competencies are rated and evidenced	• Clear guidance on how to rate knowledge for the initial submission • Knowledge accumulation during the SEPAR rated according to "notional CPD hours" (5.5 notional hours to move from one rating to another) • Guidance provided on what type of activities might constitute 5.5 notional CPD hours • Evidence may vary with activities, but will mostly include themed reflections – may also include course certificates, CPD reflections, observation forms etc.	• Candidate handbook – section 3
Increased focus on thematic reflections	• New thematic reflection template developed • Candidates encouraged to reflect on "topics" that draw on a range of CPD and applied experiences	• Candidate handbook – section 3.2.2 • Themed reflection template

Change made	Description / main changes	Where can this be found
Mapping of core workshops to specific competencies	• All core workshops have been mapped against the competencies to help candidates draw on this CPD as evidence • Where a competency is central to a workshop's content, the workshop is marked as contributing *to a large extent* to that competency • Where a competency is touched upon but may not be central to a workshop's content, the workshop is marked as contributing *to some extent* to that competency	• Candidate handbook – Annex E
Updated wording for problematic competencies	• The wording of the following competencies were updated to improve clarity o Knowledge 1.2.3, 1.3.3, 1.4.1, 1.5.1 o Skills 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.4.1, 2.5.4, 2.6.1 o Self-development and management 3.4.1, 3.4.2 o Experience ▪ 4.3.1 - wording in Table 7 updated to reflect different SEPAR pathways ▪ 4.3.1-4.3.5 – "formulation" has been added to the description	• Candidate handbook – Table 7, Annexes A-D

Table 5. SEPAR supervisor roles and responsibilities

Change made	Description / main changes	Where can this be found
Updated SEPAR Supervisor Handbook	Updated to reflect changes made through the development project. Notable areas where further detail has been added include: o Clearer guidance around supervisor responsibilities including: Supervisor competence (Section 2.1.1) Enrolment and contracting (Section 2.1.2) Supervisor-candidate relationship (Section 2.1.3) Candidate development (Section 2.1.4) Portfolio preparation and submission (Section 2.1.5) Quality assurance (Section 2.1.6) o Expanded information on additional supervisors (Section 3.1) o Updated information on observation requirements (Section 4.2) o Updated SEPAR supervisor registration form (Annex A) o New SEPAR submission process flowchart (Annex B, also in Candidate Handbook section 2.1.4)	SEPAR webpage

Change made	Description / main changes	Where can this be found
New requirement to undertake quarterly reviews	• Supervisors have a responsibility to undertake quarterly reviews with candidates every 3 months to help them them keep on track, reflect on progress and set interim targets towards SEPAR competencies • Candidates complete the quarterly review form pre-meeting, supervisor and candidate then meet to discuss, and supervisor adds comments afterwards • Candidates must submit supervisor-signed quarterly reviews as evidence within their mid-point and final portfolios	• Supervisor handbook – section 2.1.4 • Quarterly review report form
Updated supervisor training requirements	• All current supervisors and new supervisors from now must watch the SEPAR Portfolio Guidance video as part of their training	• SEPAR Portfolio Guidance Video
Increased clarity around supervisor responsibilities in portfolio development	• Clarification around supervisor responsibilities in the portfolio development process • Recommendations for candidates to submit draft portfolios to supervisors 3 weeks in advance of the deadline to allow sufficient time for review • Guidance for supervisors on how to proceed if they feel a candidate is not ready to submit	• Supervisor handbook – section 2.1.5, Annex B • Qualification handbook – section 2.7
Declaration added to final SEPAR Supervisor Report form	• Declaration added to the final supervisor report to confirm on the basis of observations they have undertaken that the candidate is fit to practise	• Supervisor report form – final
Increased clarity around supervisor responsibilities prior to enrolment	• Expanded guidance for supervisors on selecting candidates for the SEPAR, and assisting candidates in deciding whether to follow a 2-year, 3-year or 4-year pathway and whether to focus on sport only, exercise only or sport and exercise • Guidance for supervisors in reflecting on their own capacity in deciding how many candidates to take on, whilst still being able to fulfill their responsibilities as a supervisor	• Supervisor handbook – section 2.1.2 • Qualification handbook – section 2.0
Changes to eligibility to become a SEPAR supervisor	• To become a SEPAR supervisor, individuals must have been registered with the HCPC as a Sport and Exercise Psychologist for a minimum of 2 years, and been engaging in applied practice during this time (some exceptions may be made for candidates who gained their HCPC via APEC and who already have extensive applied experience)	• Supervisor handbook – section 3

Table 6. SEPAR reviewer roles and responsibilities

Change made	Description / main changes	Where can this be found
New SEPAR Reviewer Handbook	Includes guidance on reviewer roles and responsibilities, eligibility, the review process and fees.	SEPAR webpage
New SEPAR review process flowchart	Outlines the review process and responsibilities of reviewers 1 and 2 during the 8-week period that follows the submission deadline.	• Reviewer handbook – Figure 1

Change made	Description / main changes	Where can this be found
New SEPAR reviewer report forms	• Updated to reflect the revised review outcomes and to ensure clear guidance is given to candidates who are asked to re-submit • Separate re-submission report form that can be tailored to the specific requirements reviewers had asked the candidate to meet	• Reviewer handbook – Annexes F & G
New SEPAR reviewer tracking template	Developed to support reviewers in keeping track of candidates and when submissions are due.	• Reviewer handbook – Annex A
Updated reviewer training requirements	All current reviewers and new reviewers from now must watch the SEPAR Portfolio Guidance video as part of their training	SEPAR Portfolio Guidance Video
Increased clarity around reviewer roles 1 and 2	• Reviewer 1 is responsible for conducting the desk check, setting up the meeting with reviewer 2, and combining comments from both reviewers into the final report • Both reviewers are responsible for independently reviewing the portfolio, meeting to discuss and writing preliminary notes for the report • BASES will endeavour to share out roles so that reviewers are 1st reviewer for some candidates, 2nd reviewer for others	• Reviewer handbook – section 4.2 • Review process flowchart
Increased clarity around re-submission criteria and processes	• Clarification under what circumstances reviewers might ask candidates to re-submit, how to go about this, and what impact this has for the candidate • A desk check must first be done • Once the desk check is done, there are three possible outcomes: approved, additional information in 15 days (which could lead to either approval or re-submission), or re-submission	• Reviewer handbook – sections 4.3 and 4.4 • Qualification handbook – section 2.7
Guidance on tone of feedback	• Reviewer feedback should be: - written in the 2nd person - helpful, collaborative and constructive - use plain English	• Reviewer handbook – section 4.5.2
New conflict of interest guidance	• Reviewers have a responsibility to declare conflicts of interest with candidates and/or supervisors • Conflicts of interest may be apparent from the outset, but may also arise during the SEPAR • When a conflict of interest arises during SEPAR, a meeting must take place and a conflict of interest meeting record submitted to the SEPAR-AG Chair	• Reviewer handbook – section 2.3.3, Annex B • Qualification handbook – section 2.10.1
Changes to eligibility to become a SEPAR reviewer	To become a SEPAR reviewer, individuals must have been registered with the HCPC as a Sport and Exercise Psychologist for a minimum of 2 years, and been engaging in applied practice during this time (some exceptions may be made for candidates who gained their HCPC via APEC and who already have extensive applied experience)	• Reviewer handbook – section 3.1

Annex 1 – List of SEPAR documentation (August 2023)[2]

Theme	Documents
Handbooks	Candidate handbook Qualification handbook Reviewer handbook Supervisor handbook Practice placement handbook
Portfolio guidance	Portfolio guidance video
Submission checklists	Initial Mid-point Final
Competency profiles	Initial – knowledge, skills, self, experience Mid-point - knowledge, skills, self, experience Final – knowledge, skills, self, experience
Logs	Practice CPD & supervision Dissemination & citizenship Observation Core workshops Backdated hours
Action plans	Initial and mid-point Final
Philosophy templates	Initial Mid-point Final
Reflection templates	RP template 1 RP template 2 RP template 3 RP template 4 RP template – unstructured Themed reflection
Case study templates	Mid-point Final Client-practitioner relationship
Other documents	Client reference template Conflict of interest meeting record CPD reflection sheet Monitoring & evaluation sheet Observation form Psychological demands analysis sheet Quarterly review report Therapeutic risk assessment
Supervisor report forms	Initial Mid-point Final
Reviewer documents	Review process flowchart Reviewer report form Reviewer report form (resubmission) Reviewer tracking template

[2] Excludes any pre-enrolment documents, existing APEC documentation, and supervisor/reviewer training documents