Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Brunel
Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	28 – 29 January 2014

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'occupational therapist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 3 March 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 March 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 24 February 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 March 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and awarding body reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Joanne Stead (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	50
First approved intake	September 2007
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2014
Chair	Derek Milligan
Secretary	Sally McKinley
Members of the joint panel	Mary Richards (Internal Panel Member) Malcolm Clarke (Internal Panel Member) Miranda Thew (External Panel Member) Caroline Grant (Education Officer) Christopher McKenna (College of Occupational Therapists) Teena Clouston (College of Occupational Therapists)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining two SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for ongoing approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for ongoing approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

Condition: The education provider must ensure the programme documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation for Occupational therapy.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect terminology and information. For example, page seven of the Student Programme Handbook states a requirement to 'meet the minimum of 1,000 hours of practice placements required by the Health and Care Professions Council'. The HCPC does not have prescriptive requirements in terms of hours of practice. The HCPC's requirements around placement are for the education provider to demonstrate that students who complete their programme meet the standards of proficiency. Also the visitors noted in the programme specification (page two) that the programme is 'accredited' by HCPC, rather than it is 'approved' by HCPC, which is the correct terminology. The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation and feel that incorrect and inaccurate statements may mislead students and provide an incorrect impression of the HCPC as the statutory regulator. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation, and avoids any potential confusion for students.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Joanna Goodwin
Joanne Stead

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme name	BA (Hons) Degree in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	4 – 5 March 2014

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 8 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 30 April 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social Work (in England) profession came onto the register in August 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MA Degree in Social Work, PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only) and Postgraduate Certificate Mental Health Practice. The professional body (for the social work provision) and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Richard Barker (Social worker) Paula Sobiechowska (Social worker) Shaaron Pratt (Radiographer)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	50 per cohort once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Sue Palmer (Leeds Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Sheila Casey (Leeds Metropolitan University)
Members of the joint panel	Julie Irvine (The College of Social Work) Sue Furness (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining two SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to show that resources in place effectively support the required learning and teaching activities for this programme.

Reason: From the review of the documentation, the visitors noted students were expected to secure some voluntary or paid work experience for the Development of Professional Skills level 4. Students would "not be able to successfully complete the module unless you have completed this experience and there will be no exceptions to this" (module handbook Development of Professional Skills, page 2). The visitors also noted the module descriptor stated the module "requires students to take an active role in their own learning journey, demonstrate professionalism and apply transferable learning skills in a voluntary or paid social care setting" (Module Approval Template (MAT) Development of Professional Skills level 4). The visitors had concerns about the students seeking their own volunteering or paid employment experience without the programme team undertaking checks to ensure they are safe, supportive and appropriate for the students learning. During discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt students will provide the details of the organisation who will offer voluntary or paid employment to the education provider and the education provider will ensure they provide a safe and supportive environment for students' learning. However, this information was not stated within the documentation. The visitors considered it to be important to have this documented and therefore require the education provider to revise programme documentation to show this information is clearly articulated. In this way, the visitors will be assured the resources in place effectively support the required learning and teaching activities for this programme.

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to show the requirements for students progression clearly articulated in the documentation.

Reason: From the review of the documentation, the visitors noted a lack of clarity when referring to expectations for student progression. In the module handbook Development of Professional Skills it says, "As part of the module you will be expected to secure some voluntary or paid work experience, working directly with an appropriate service user group… you will not be able to successfully complete the module unless you have completed this experience and there will be no exceptions to this" (page 2). The visitors considered it to be unclear as to whether the experience is expected or required. The visitors also noted it was stated as being expected within the student handbook (page 21). During discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt students will need to complete this learning outcome in order to progress. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit programme documentation to clarify this programme requirement.

Recommendations

3.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider continue exploring ways to support students financially whilst they are on placements.

Reason: The visitors are satisfied the programme provides support for the students in all settings and are therefore satisfied this standard is met. The visitors noted during meetings with the placement providers / educators and students that students have raised concerns around the travel costs whilst on placement with one particular placement provider. The programme team indicated they are aware of this concern. It was also highlighted that students are made aware before joining the programme that the placements may incur travel costs. The programme team indicated that due to financial constraints placements providers find it hard to support students financially for costs incurred during placements. The visitors recommend the programme team continue to work closely with the placement providers to support students including considering ways to support students financially.

<div align="right">

Richard Barker
Paula Sobiechowska
Shaaron Pratt

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	South Essex College of Further and Higher Education
Validating body / Awarding body	University of Essex
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	30 – 31 January 2014

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 10 March 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 March 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 21 March 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 15 May 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider and validating body did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Jane McLenachan (Social worker) Dorothy Smith (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	30 per year
First approved intake	May 2006
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2014
Chair	Allan Hildon (University of Essex)
Secretary	Rachel Brown (University of Essex)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining six SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the resources provided to support students through the programme accurately reflect the current setting of regulation for social workers in England.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation submitted by the education provider prior to the visit, the visitors found references to the HCPC and professional body were not consistently accurate. For example, the module descriptor for SW111 states, **"**All trainee social workers are required to register with the HCPC". This is a requirement of the previous regulator. Admissions information also referred to the previous regulator in referencing the "National Occupational Standards", and stated the HCPC is involved in addressing placement shortages. This inaccurate information in the documentation requires correcting. The visitors also noted the module descriptor for SW319 refers to the "HCPC professional capabilities framework". This is the professional body's framework and should not be associated with the HCPC. This SET requires the resources supporting students through the programme to be correct and consistent, including programme documents. The visitors therefore require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instances of inaccurate or out-of-date terminology. In this way the visitors can ensure any potential confusion for students between the regulatory body and the professional body is avoided.

3.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the attendance policies are communicated clearly to students, and implemented consistently.

Reason: The visitors noted a lack of clarity in the programme documentation's description of the attendance policy, particularly regarding any resulting implications for absences. In the programme handbook page 6, it states all classes are compulsory, and indicates what circumstances could reasonably be accepted for absence (such as serious illness). It does not include what would happen if the 100 per cent attendance target is not achieved. The practice placement handbook states on page 31, "If your attendance falls below 90% within a review period (as per the policy) you will be subject to the colleges academic performance procedures." However, the visitors could not find further detail of the policy referred to or the 'academic performance procedures'. The programme team stated that they would follow up any unexplained absences with students, and that the education provider has processes in place if attendance falls below 90 per cent. Discussions with students indicated they were aware they should attend all classes wherever possible, but there was some confusion as to what level of absence would be followed up (80 or 90 per cent), and what the implications would be. They also highlighted some discrepancies in the monitoring of attendance, as registers were inconsistently taken. The visitors noted the students understood the set number of days required for placements. However, ambiguity in aspects of how the attendance policy is applied in the academic setting may affect students' attendance records, or lead to their missing large parts of the curriculum's delivery. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide further evidence as to how they ensure students

are informed of the attendance policies applicable and how they are implemented and monitored.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The programme team must provide further clarity in the documentation as to the core modules which need to be passed throughout the programme, in order to demonstrate that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for social workers in England (SOPs).

Reason: The visitors noted from the Programme Specification the programme will follow the Rules of Assessment as set out by the validating body (University of Essex). The Rules of Assessment outline the requirements for the final award. The visitors noted students can graduate with 330 credits, without passing all 360 credits, providing all core modules are passed. However, the visitors were unable to find detail within the module descriptors or programme specification as to which modules are core for this programme and need to be passed. They were therefore unable to determine whether a student graduating from the programme with 330 credits will have been assessed as meeting all of the standards of proficiency for social workers in England (SOPs). The visitors also noted there was limited information in the module descriptors to indicate whether all assessment elements must be passed where there are multiple assessments within a module, or whether an aggregate mark would be taken. Where there are assignments which do not need to be passed in order to complete the module, the visitors require information as to the justification for this to ensure that the assessment of all SOPs is not compromised. They therefore require further clarity as to the final award requirements for the programme, in order to ensure that all SOPs will be met by students upon graduation.

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations and programme documentation clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement for the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the Programme Specification the programme will follow the Rules of Assessment as set out by the validating body (University of Essex). The Rules of Assessment outline the requirements for student progression through the programme and for the final award. As stated in the condition against SET 6.1, the visitors noted students can progress from year to year and to graduation without passing all attempted credits, providing all core modules are passed. However, the visitors were unable to find detail within the module descriptors or programme specification as to which modules are core for this programme and need to be passed. They were therefore unable to determine the progression and achievement requirements. The visitors also noted that there was limited information in the module descriptors to indicate whether all assessment elements must be passed where there are multiple assessments, or if the aggregate mark would be taken. They therefore require further clarity of the progression and achievement arrangements for the programme, and evidence that any module or programme-specific requirements, or

variations to the Rules of Assessment are communicated clearly to students on this programme.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must ensure students understand the requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

Reason: The visitors were referred to the education provider's extenuating circumstances policy as evidence for this SET, which states, "In the case of severe extenuating circumstances affecting the final months of a final year student's studies there is provision for a Board to consider the award of an aegrotat degree." The SETs mapping also states that this aegrotat award is an unnamed award that does not provide eligibility for access to the HCPC Register. However, from the evidence provided the visitors could not determine where there was a clear statement in the programme documentation or assessment regulations that aegrotat awards would not provide eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not lead to eligibility to register as a social worker in England. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to where the policy for aegrotat awards in relation to professional registration is laid out, and how students are informed about this.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The programme team must submit further evidence that there will be at least one external examiner who will be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to this programme. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiner to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will continue to be met.

Recommendations

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Recommendation: If the programme introduces interprofessional learning opportunities as discussed at the visit, they must notify the HCPC through the major change process to ensure that the profession-specific skills of social workers are addressed.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that this standard is met under current arrangements. However, the visitors were informed of the potential to incorporate interprofessional learning opportunities for various areas including mental health, counselling, early years and special education. If this development occurs the visitors recommend that the programme team inform the HCPC of this change at the earliest opportunity through the major change process. In this way the HCPC can ensure that the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group is being adequately addressed through this interprofessional learning and that this standard continues to be met.

<div align="right">

Dorothy Smith
Jane McLenachan

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Birmingham
Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Specialist Work in Mental Health Services (Approved Mental Health Professional)
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Type of programme	Approved mental health professional
Date of visit	7 – 8 January 2014

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using a protected title must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register or have an annotation on their Registration record, the HCPC also approve a small number of programmes which are not linked to HCPC Registration. These programmes are for the profession of approved mental health professionals (AMHPs) (for social workers, mental health and learning disabilities nurses, occupational therapists and practitioner psychologists).

The HCPC criteria for approving AMHP programmes set out the systems and processes an education provider is expected to have in place to deliver an AMHP programme, as well as the competencies professionals must achieve on completing the programme.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 18 February 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 March 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 3 March 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 March 2014.

Introduction

When the regulation of social workers in England transferred from the General Social Care Council (GSCC) to ourselves, we took responsibility for approving AMHP programmes in England. The Health and Social Care Act (2012) gives us powers to set approval criteria for AMHP programmes. A decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing AMHP programmes. This visit is to assess the programmes against the approval criteria for AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals.

During the approval process, the education provider informed us that they were changing the name of the transitionally approved programme, "Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Specialist (Social) Work in Mental Health Services (Approved Mental Health Professional)", to the programme name as stated at the top of this report. Therefore, this programme remains transitionally approved until its approval status is amended by the HCPC.

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered Postgraduate Diploma in Higher Specialist Work in Mental Health Services (Approved Mental Health Professional). A separate visitor report exists for this programme.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and visitor role	Steve Benson (Approved mental health professional)
	Sheila Skelton (Approved mental health professional)
	Derek Adrian-Harris (Radiographer)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	40 Inclusive of Postgraduate Diploma in Higher Specialist Work in Mental Health Services (Approved Mental Health Professional)
First approved intake	April 2014
Chair	Alistair Hewison (University of Birmingham)
Secretary	Davina Weston (University of Birmingham)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met section 1 of the approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met section 2 of the approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the approval criteria for AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 47 of the criteria have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three criteria.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when a certain criterion has not been met or there is insufficient evidence of a criterion being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular criterion has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

D.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate how they maintain a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: Documentation submitted before the visit included information about the education provider's practice placement policies such as Practice Mentors Assessors' (PMAs) training and the Programme Management Group (PMG) however there was no information about the initial approval or ongoing monitoring of placements. At the visit, discussion in the meetings with the practice placement providers and with the programme team indicated the local authorities were responsible for managing placements, including ensuring settings are appropriate and managing any difficulties that may arise, with limited involvement from the education provider. The visitors noted there was a PMG meeting which includes representatives from all practice placement providers and members of the programme team. It was clear that there were informal protocols in place if an issue was identified at a practice placement, however the visitors were unable to find a formal system for the initial approval and ongoing monitoring of all placements The visitors also could not determine how the education provider maintains overall responsibility of the approval and monitoring of placements to ensure they are safe and appropriate settings. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring all placements.

E.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme

Condition: The education provider must confirm the programme title, ensure the programme documentation, including advertising materials, articulates all programme awards consistently and clearly, and articulates whether the awards will lead to eligibility to apply to work as an AMHP within a local authority.

Reason: From the documentation submitted before the visit and discussions at the visit regarding the programme title, it was apparent the education provider is required to change and confirm the final award that would lead eligibility to apply and work as an AMHP within a local authority. The programme is also contained within a suite of different post qualification awards. This criterion requires education providers to clearly articulate students' progression and achievements within the programme documents and therefore the awards that can and cannot lead to eligibility to apply to work as an AMHP within a local authority. During the programme team meeting, the visitors highlighted that the draft programme documentation referred to the different programme titles inconsistently and in discussion with the programme team consensus was reached as to what will be the award titles. In order to determine this criterion is met the visitors require the education provider to confirm the approved programme titles, ensure the programme documentation, including advertising materials, articulates all programme awards consistently and clearly, and articulates whether the awards will lead to eligibility to apply to work as an AMHP within a local authority or otherwise.

E.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register

Condition: The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register. The visitors saw curriculum vitae for the current external examiner at the visit and were satisfied they were appropriately experienced and qualified for the role as external examiner. In discussion with the programme team it was indicated the programme team would take account of this standard and update programme documents. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors need to see evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

Recommendation

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team consider further strengthening the current and future plans for service user and carer involvement.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the service users and carers are involved in the programmes and so determined this criterion is met. Discussion with the students indicated the contribution of service users and carers was valuable to their learning. During discussions with the programme team, it was indicated that there are planned future developments with service user and carer involvement in different aspects of the programme, such as delivering curriculum and assessing students' performance, however provided limited detail about how this would be done, or the extent of their involvement. The visitors recommend the programme team consider further strengthening the current and future plans for service user and carer involvement. The visitors suggest that a more robust service user and carer involvement will allow a greater depth to students' learning and other aspects of the programme.

<div align="right">

Steve Benson
Sheila Skelton
Derek Adrian-Harris

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Birmingham
Programme name	Postgraduate Diploma in Higher Specialist Work in Mental Health Services (Approved Mental Health Professional)
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Type of programme	Approved mental health professional
Date of visit	7 – 8 January 2014

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using a protected title must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register or have an annotation on their Registration record, the HCPC also approve a small number of programmes which are not linked to HCPC Registration. These programmes are for the profession of approved mental health professionals (AMHPs) (for social workers, mental health and learning disabilities nurses, occupational therapists and practitioner psychologists).

The HCPC criteria for approving AMHP programmes set out the systems and processes an education provider is expected to have in place to deliver an AMHP programme, as well as the competencies professionals must achieve on completing the programme.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 18 February 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 March 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 3 March 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 March 2014.

Introduction

When the regulation of social workers in England transferred from the General Social Care Council (GSCC) to ourselves, we took responsibility for approving AMHP programmes in England. The Health and Social Care Act (2012) gives us powers to set approval criteria for AMHP programmes. A decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing AMHP programmes. This visit is to assess the programmes against the approval criteria for AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals.

During the approval process, the education provider informed us that they were changing the name of the transitionally approved programme, "Postgraduate Diploma in Higher Specialist (Social) Work in Mental Health Services (Approved Mental Health Professional)", to the programme name as stated at the top of this report. Therefore, this programme remains transitionally approved until its approval status is amended by the HCPC.

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Specialist Work in Mental Health Services (Approved Mental Health Professional). A separate visitor report exists for this programme.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and visitor role	Steve Benson (Approved mental health professional)
	Sheila Skelton (Approved mental health professional)
	Derek Adrian-Harris (Radiographer)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	40 per year, inclusive of Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Specialist Work in Mental Health Services (Approved Mental Health Professional)
First approved intake	April 2014
Chair	Alistair Hewison (University of Birmingham)
Secretary	Davina Weston (University of Birmingham)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met section 1 of the approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met section 2 of the approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it. The HCPC met with graduates from the existing transitionally approved Postgraduate Diploma in Higher Specialist Social Work in Mental Health (AMHP) programme that leads to eligibility to apply to work as an approved mental health professional.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the approval criteria for AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 47 of the criteria have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three criteria.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when a certain criterion has not been met or there is insufficient evidence of a criterion being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular criterion has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

D.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate how they maintain a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: Documentation submitted before the visit included information about the education provider's practice placement policies such as Practice Mentors Assessors' (PMAs) training and the Programme Management Group (PMG) however there was no information about the initial approval or ongoing monitoring of placements. At the visit, discussion in the meetings with the practice placement providers and with the programme team indicated the local authorities were responsible for managing placements, including ensuring settings are appropriate and managing any difficulties that may arise, with limited involvement from the education provider. The visitors noted there was a PMG meeting which includes representatives from all practice placement providers and members of the programme team. It was clear that there were informal protocols in place if an issue was identified at a practice placement, however the visitors were unable to find a formal system for the initial approval and ongoing monitoring of all placements The visitors also could not determine how the education provider maintains overall responsibility of the approval and monitoring of placements to ensure they are safe and appropriate settings. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring all placements.

E.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme

Condition: The education provider must confirm the programme title, ensure the programme documentation, including advertising materials, articulates all programme awards consistently and clearly, and articulates whether the awards will lead to eligibility to apply to work as an AMHP within a local authority.

Reason: From the documentation submitted before the visit and discussions at the visit regarding the programme title, it was apparent the education provider is required to change and confirm the final award that would lead eligibility to apply and work as an AMHP within a local authority. The programme is also contained within a suite of different post qualification awards. This criterion requires education providers to clearly articulate students' progression and achievements within the programme documents and therefore the awards that can and cannot lead to eligibility to apply to work as an AMHP within a local authority. During the programme team meeting, the visitors highlighted that the draft programme documentation referred to the different programme titles inconsistently and in discussion with the programme team consensus was reached as to what will be the award titles. In order to determine this criterion is met the visitors require the education provider to confirm the approved programme titles, ensure the programme documentation, including advertising materials, articulates all programme awards consistently and clearly, and articulates whether the awards will lead to eligibility to apply to work as an AMHP within a local authority or otherwise.

E.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register

Condition: The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register. The visitors saw curriculum vitae for the current external examiner at the visit and were satisfied they were appropriately experienced and qualified for the role as external examiner. In discussion with the programme team it was indicated the programme team would take account of this standard and update programme documents. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors need to see evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

Recommendation

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team consider further strengthening the current and future plans for service user and carer involvement.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the service users and carers are involved in the programmes and so determined this criterion is met. Discussion with the students indicated the contribution of service users and carers was valuable to their learning. During discussions with the programme team, it was indicated that there are planned future developments with service user and carer involvement in different aspects of the programme, such as delivering curriculum and assessing students' performance, however provided limited detail about how this would be done, or the extent of their involvement. The visitors recommend the programme team consider further strengthening the current and future plans for service user and carer involvement. The visitors suggest that a more robust service user and carer involvement will allow a greater depth to students' learning and other aspects of the programme.

<div align="right">

Steve Benson
Sheila Skelton
Derek Adrian-Harris

</div>