Applications Appeals Procedure

## 1. Introduction

The Forum for Independent Psychotherapists (FiP) operates a formal process in respect of appeals against a decision made concerning an application for membership or accreditation.

If an applicant is unhappy with the outcome of their application they should write to the head of the Ethics sub-committee entitling their letter ‘Formal Appeal’. The letter should be sent care of FiP’s administrator either to our registered office or via email. The address details are as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| email: administrator@fip.org.uk,or by post toHead of FiP Ethics Sub-committeec/o FiP Administrator, 66 Smirrells Road, Hall Green, Birmingham B28 0LB. |

An appeal letter should detail the proposed grounds for appeal and should include any relevant information in support of the appellant’s concerns.

If an applicant is unhappy with the handling of their application but is not seeking to challenge the decision they should make a complaint via FiP’s organisational complaint process which is signposted on our website.

Appeals regarding applications must be made within six weeks of the date the applicant was notified of FiP’s decision. Receipt of an appeal will be acknowledged in writing within 7 days.

## 2. Grounds for appeal

Examples of grounds for an appeal are:

* Administrative shortcomings – for example, all submitted documentation was not passed to the appropriate committee.
* Lack of equal opportunities – for example, any contravention of FiP’s equality, diversity and inclusion statement.
* If you feel an unfair judgement has been made about your competence based on the evidence you have submitted. You must give clear information about this and relate it to FiP’s published Membership and Accreditation criteria which are accessible via the “How to join FiP” section of FiP’s website.

NB. It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide the evidence required to support their application. Whilst FiP will endeavour to be appropriately flexible regarding the precise nature of evidence that will be accepted, is not grounds for appeal that FiP has not located evidence that the applicant has not themselves provided.

## 3. Outline process

In order to ensure independence applications appeals are managed by FiP’s ethics sub-committee:

### 3.1 Investigators appointed

The head of the ethics sub-committee will identify two members to investigate the facts of the application. One will be a member of the ethics team the other a senior members of FiP (i.e. having more than 5 years post registration experience). Members hearing an application appeal may be members of the applications sub-committee ‘pool’ but only if they have not been involved in any way with processing the original application.

### 3.2 Investigation

The investigation will review the appeal in conjunction with copies of the original application and subsequent correspondence. The review will be undertaken with reference to FiP’s applications process documentation (i.e. process guidelines, eligibility criteria and applications forms)

The investigators will summarise their findings highlighting any points of concern or requiring clarification. They will report to the head of the ethics sub-committee.

### 3.3 Reporting

The head of the ethics sub-committee will discuss the outcome and recommendations with the head of the applications sub-committee. The possible outcomes of this discussion are:

* Both agree that the original decision was correct in which case the chair of the ethics committee will arrange to communicate the outcome with a summary of the reasons the application has failed.
* The review has identified some uncertainty regarding the interpretation of either FiP’s policy or, in the case of an accreditation, FiP’s interpretation of ‘Equivalence’ to UKCP SET’s. In this case the head of the applications sub-committee may be requested to revisit the policy in question and, if necessary, to seek clarification from UKCP/CPJA regarding any technical questions.
* The head of ethics believes that the original decision was flawed.
	+ If the head of the applications sub-committee agrees with the review decision then, in conjunction with the head of the ethics sub-committee a suitable letter will be drafted for approval by the board which sets out the detail of the decision. The outcome might not at this stage be a recommendation to accredit the individual or admit the applicant to membership; It could be to recommend specific further training or experience to meet deficiencies that are still believed to remain. The letter will be approved by the board before sending to ensure any potential modifications to FiP’s processes or policy interpretation are agreed and implemented.
	+ If there is a disagreement based on the interpretation and application of accreditation or admission criteria the matter will be added to the next board agenda for discussion. The chair may request clarification from UKCP/CPJA regarding any technical questions.

## 4. Final appeal review

The head of FiP’s ethics sub-committee will respond to the appeal within two months. If the applicant remains unsatisfied with the outcome they can ask for a further review by the chair of FiP.

If an appeal is escalated to the chair of FiP their decision will be final.

|  |
| --- |
| If at the end of FiP’s appeal process, the applicant feels the organisation has failed to address their concerns, they can raise a complaint with UKCP by completing their form ‘Reporting a complaint about an organisational member of UKCP’. |