

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	PG Certificate in Approved Mental Health Practice (incorporating AMHP training), Part time
Approval visit date	19-20 September 2018
Case reference	CAS-13289-DOS6W9

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4
Section 5 Visitors' recommendation	6

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Jane Hutchison	Approved Mental Health Professional
David Packwood	Practitioner psychologist
Frances Ashworth	Lay
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive
Tamara Wasylec	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Karen Castle	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Manchester Metropolitan University
Anna Peters	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Manchester Metropolitan University
Dr Robert Wu	External panel member	University of Birmingham

Deborah O'Connor	Internal panel member	Manchester Metropolitan University
Arina Vaisvilaite	Internal panel member	Manchester Metropolitan University
Orlagh McCabe	Internal panel member	Manchester Metropolitan University

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	PG Certificate in Approved Mental Health Practice (incorporating AMHP training)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Approved mental health professional
First intake	01 January 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01952

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	This is a new programme therefore no external examiner reports have been produced for this programme

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	Learners were from the PG Cert Advanced Social Work programme
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice education providers	Yes	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	
Facilities and resources	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 19 November 2018

A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate what programme information is available to applicants, so that they can make an informed choice about whether they take up the offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation provided, including information to be included on the admissions web pages for the programme. They could not see how learners and referring employees could access information relating to the admissions procedures. The visitors considered that there was a risk that applicants and referring employers would not have the information they require to apply to the programme.. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence which demonstrates how they will ensure that all applicants have access to appropriate information to enable them to make an informed choice about the programme.

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that how the programme delivery pattern is appropriate for the programme to be effectively managed

Reason: At the programme team meeting, it was mentioned in the presentation that the education provider will deliver the programme in a split pattern, where learners will be taught 2 days on campus and 3 days at the placement. However, from the information provided it was not clear if this pattern is confirmed and how will it be managed. Since the teaching delivery is partnership based, the visitors were unable to determine how the arrangements for on campus teaching will be overseen, and how management systems and structures of the practice placement providers will work. Additionally, the visitors are unclear how it is ensured that everyone involved has a clear understanding of their responsibilities. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that shows that the pattern of delivery is feasible, and what systems are in place to ensure effective delivery of the programme.

B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver this programme.

Reason: During discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told that the maximum number of learners for the first cohort will be 20 and that there is sufficient staff to deliver the programme during the first year. However, the programme team confirmed that the learner numbers will go up to 30 from the second year. Additionally, the education provider mentioned that the teaching pattern will consist of a five day teaching week split into two days in the classroom and three days in practice-based learning. The visitors could not determine how the education provider will manage staff resourcing for the subsequent year to manage an increased cohort of 30 learners. The visitors also require information as to how the required experience and qualification profile of the new staff members will complement the team to ensure they can support the delivery of the breadth of knowledge taught on this programme. This includes clarity on Rachel Rooke's role, as the programme team mentioned that she will be contributing as a consultant teacher, but in the practice educators meeting she stated that this job appointment was yet to be confirmed. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the education provider's plan to support the delivery of the programme ensuring that there will be sufficient qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme when learner numbers increase.

D.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that all practice educators are appropriately trained.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the practice handbook which consisted of a description of the role and responsibilities of the practice educator. However, they could not see anywhere in the programme documentation a clear statement that all practice educators

must undertake appropriate training before they can supervise learners or how they ensure that all practice educators have completed the training. In the practice handbook page 57, it states under practice placement educators heading “All PPE’s will be offered support and training by the programme team”. The visitors noted that this statement suggests that the training is optional and therefore could not determine how practice educators would know that they must attend training or how education provider ensures that all practice educators engage in appropriate training. As such, they could not determine that the standard was met. They therefore require the education provider to submit evidence showing, by what mechanism, they will ensure that all practice educators undergo the mandatory 3 day training described at the visit, which is specific to their role, before supervising learners on this programme.

Section 5 Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the conditions set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend that the programme is approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 05 December 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).