

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	19 – 20 January 2016

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	4
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	8

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 14 March 2016 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 23 March 2016. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 14 March 2016. 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 20 May 2016.

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 - the 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 the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes; BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Full time, MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) - Full time accelerated and Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Therapy - Full time accelerated. 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 all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the new full time route of this programme. 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, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dawn Fraser (Occupational therapist) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Manoj Mistry (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Hollie Latham Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, one cohort per year
First approved intake	September 2006
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2016
Chair	David Penman (University of Essex)
Secretary	Kirsty Sceats (University of Essex)
Members of the joint panel	Rebecca Khanna (College of Occupational Therapists) Joan Healey (College of Occupational Therapists) Clair Parkin (College of Occupational Therapists) Alex Whithair (Student panel member) Nicky Slee (Internal panel member) Lesley Wilson (External panel member)

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval the visitors must be satisfied 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 the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining SET.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. 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 number of recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to ensure accurate and consistent information is provided regarding placement hours.

Reason: Within the programme documentation the visitors noted inconsistencies in the required placement hours stated. For example within the Practice Placement Handbook:

- page 11 states “The programme enables students to undertake a minimum of 1056 hours in practice...”;
- page 15 states “Students on the programme will undertake a minimum of 1000 hours in practice...”, and;
- page 38 states an outlined placement week of 37.5 hours across 28 weeks which totals 1050 hours

Also, the visitors noted that the placement hours as stated within each placement module have a combined total of 1073 hours + preparation for placement hours. In addition to this the visitors noted that the placement structure did not take into account any bank holidays throughout the year. The visitors note that bank holidays will impact on the number of hours that will be achievable in the stated timeframes. Without clarity of the required and available placement hours for the programme and a clear timeline of where placement hours are to be achieved, the visitors are unable to make a judgement on the duration of practice placements for this programme. The visitors therefore require documentation which clearly defines the required and available placement hours for the programme and that they are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Recommendations

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the current level of service user and carer involvement for the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and service user group, it was clear that there is currently a level of service user and carer involvement in the programme and appropriate support is in place for these members. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the level of involvement is minimal from service users and carers and this is currently on an ad hoc basis. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that service users and carers are involved and supported they considered that the current structure poses a risk to continued involvement for the programme. Specifically, the visitors noted that there is no formalised training identified for training service users and carers. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team considers reviewing the current level of service user and carer involvement for the programme.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the module descriptors to provide more clarity on the specific standards of proficiency (SOPs) being delivered within each module.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team it was clear that the SOPs are being delivered within the current modules. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the majority of module descriptors for the programme refer to the overarching SOPs as opposed to individual SOPs. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that the individual SOPs were being delivered from reviewing the SOPs mapping document, they considered the lack of detail within the module descriptors could pose a risk to future delivery of the modules. Specifically, the visitors noted that having this detail might better support any future changes to the programme including module updates and changes to programme staff. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team revisit the module descriptors to provide more clarity on the specific SOPs to be delivered within each module.

5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider strengthening the monitoring of attendance for practice placement educators when delivering new and refresher training.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and the practice placement providers, it was clear that the education provider runs regular training sessions for practice placement educators as well as ensuring a currency in their knowledge. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the monitoring of attendance of practice placement educators is currently minimal. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that practice educators are attending

appropriate training, they considered the level of monitoring of training could pose a risk to the future attendance of practice educators at required training sessions. Specifically the visitors noted that the programme team could better evaluate where any additional training may be delivered to those who could not attend. Therefore, the visitors recommend that the programme team revisits the current process for monitoring the attendance of practice placement educators when delivering new and refresher training.

Dawn Fraser
Joanna Goodwin
Manoj Mistry

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme name	MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time accelerated
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	19 – 20 January 2016

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	4
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	8

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 14 March 2016 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 23 March 2016. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 14 March 2016. 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 20 May 2016.

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 - the 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 the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes; BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Part time, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Full time and Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Therapy – Full time accelerated. The education provider, the professional bodies 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 education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dawn Fraser (Occupational therapist) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Manoj Mistry (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	45 per cohort, one cohort per year (Including the Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Therapy)
First approved intake	September 2010
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2016
Chair	David Penman (University of Essex)
Secretary	Kirsty Sceats (University of Essex)
Members of the joint panel	Rebecca Khanna (College of Occupational Therapists) Joan Healey (College of Occupational Therapists) Clair Parkin (College of Occupational Therapists) Alex Whithair (Student panel member) Nicky Slee (Internal panel member) Lesley Wilson (External panel member)

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval the visitors must be satisfied 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 the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining SET.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. 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 number of recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to ensure accurate and consistent information is provided regarding placement hours.

Reason: Within the programme documentation the visitors noted inconsistencies in the required placement hours stated. For example within the Practice Placement Handbook:

- page 11 states “The programme enables students to undertake a minimum of 1056 hours in practice...”;
- page 15 states “Students on the programme will undertake a minimum of 1000 hours in practice...”, and;
- page 38 states an outlined placement week of 37.5 hours across 28 weeks which totals 1050 hours

Also, the visitors noted that the placement hours as stated within each placement module have a combined total of 1073 hours + preparation for placement hours. In addition to this the visitors noted that the placement structure did not take into account any bank holidays throughout the year. The visitors note that bank holidays will impact on the number of hours that will be achievable in the stated timeframes. Without clarity of the required and available placement hours for the programme and a clear timeline of where placement hours are to be achieved, the visitors are unable to make a judgement on the duration of practice placements for this programme. The visitors therefore require documentation which clearly defines the required and available placement hours for the programme and that they are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Recommendations

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the current level of service user and carer involvement for the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and service user group, it was clear that there is currently a level of service user and carer involvement in the programme and appropriate support is in place for these members. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the level of involvement is minimal from service users and carers and this is currently on an ad hoc basis. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that service users and carers are involved and supported they considered that the current structure poses a risk to continued involvement for the programme. Specifically, the visitors noted that there is no formalised training identified for training service users and carers. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team considers reviewing the current level of service user and carer involvement for the programme.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the module descriptors to provide more clarity on the specific standards of proficiency (SOPs) being delivered within each module.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team it was clear that the SOPs are being delivered within the current modules. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the majority of module descriptors for the programme refer to the overarching SOPs as opposed to individual SOPs. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that the individual SOPs were being delivered from reviewing the SOPs mapping document, they considered the lack of detail within the module descriptors could pose a risk to future delivery of the modules. Specifically, the visitors noted that having this detail might better support any future changes to the programme including module updates and changes to programme staff. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team revisit the module descriptors to provide more clarity on the specific SOPs to be delivered within each module.

5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider strengthening the monitoring of attendance for practice placement educators when delivering new and refresher training.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and the practice placement providers, it was clear that the education provider runs regular training sessions for practice placement educators as well as ensuring a currency in their knowledge. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the monitoring of attendance of practice placement educators is currently minimal. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that practice educators are attending

appropriate training, they considered the level of monitoring of training could pose a risk to the future attendance of practice educators at required training sessions. Specifically the visitors noted that the programme team could better evaluate where any additional training may be delivered to those who could not attend. Therefore, the visitors recommend that the programme team revisits the current process for monitoring the attendance of practice placement educators when delivering new and refresher training.

Dawn Fraser
Joanna Goodwin
Manoj Mistry

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time accelerated
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	19 – 20 January 2016

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	4
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	8

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 14 March 2016 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 23 March 2016. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 14 March 2016. 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 20 May 2016.

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 - the 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 the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes; BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Part time, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Full time and MSc Occupational Therapy – Full time accelerated. 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 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 education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dawn Fraser (Occupational therapist) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Manoj Mistry (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	45 per cohort, one cohort per year (Including the MSc Occupational Therapy)
First approved intake	September 2010
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2016
Chair	David Penman (University of Essex)
Secretary	Kirsty Sceats (University of Essex)
Members of the joint panel	Rebecca Khanna (College of Occupational Therapists) Joan Healey (College of Occupational Therapists) Clair Parkin (College of Occupational Therapists) Alex Whithair (Student panel member) Nicky Slee (Internal panel member) Lesley Wilson (External panel member)

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval the visitors must be satisfied 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 the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining SET.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. 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 number of recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to ensure accurate and consistent information is provided regarding placement hours.

Reason: Within the programme documentation the visitors noted inconsistencies in the required placement hours stated. For example within the Practice Placement Handbook:

- page 11 states “The programme enables students to undertake a minimum of 1056 hours in practice...”;
- page 15 states “Students on the programme will undertake a minimum of 1000 hours in practice...”, and;
- page 38 states an outlined placement week of 37.5 hours across 28 weeks which totals 1050 hours

Also, the visitors noted that the placement hours as stated within each placement module have a combined total of 1073 hours + preparation for placement hours. In addition to this the visitors noted that the placement structure did not take into account any bank holidays throughout the year. The visitors note that bank holidays will impact on the number of hours that will be achievable in the stated timeframes. Without clarity of the required and available placement hours for the programme and a clear timeline of where placement hours are to be achieved, the visitors are unable to make a judgement on the duration of practice placements for this programme. The visitors therefore require documentation which clearly defines the required and available placement hours for the programme and that they are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Recommendations

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the current level of service user and carer involvement for the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and service user group, it was clear that there is currently a level of service user and carer involvement in the programme and appropriate support is in place for these members. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the level of involvement is minimal from service users and carers and this is currently on an ad hoc basis. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that service users and carers are involved and supported they considered that the current structure poses a risk to continued involvement for the programme. Specifically, the visitors noted that there is no formalised training identified for training service users and carers. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team considers reviewing the current level of service user and carer involvement for the programme.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the module descriptors to provide more clarity on the specific standards of proficiency (SOPs) being delivered within each module.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team it was clear that the SOPs are being delivered within the current modules. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the majority of module descriptors for the programme refer to the overarching SOPs as opposed to individual SOPs. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that the individual SOPs were being delivered from reviewing the SOPs mapping document, they considered the lack of detail within the module descriptors could pose a risk to future delivery of the modules. Specifically, the visitors noted that having this detail might better support any future changes to the programme including module updates and changes to programme staff. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team revisit the module descriptors to provide more clarity on the specific SOPs to be delivered within each module.

5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider strengthening the monitoring of attendance for practice placement educators when delivering new and refresher training.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and the practice placement providers, it was clear that the education provider runs regular training sessions for practice placement educators as well as ensuring a currency in their knowledge. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the monitoring of attendance of practice placement educators is currently minimal. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that practice educators are attending

appropriate training, they considered the level of monitoring of training could pose a risk to the future attendance of practice educators at required training sessions. Specifically the visitors noted that the programme team could better evaluate where any additional training may be delivered to those who could not attend. Therefore, the visitors recommend that the programme team revisits the current process for monitoring the attendance of practice placement educators when delivering new and refresher training.

Dawn Fraser
Joanna Goodwin
Manoj Mistry

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational therapist
Date of visit	19 – 20 January 2016

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	4
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	8

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 14 March 2016 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 23 March 2016. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 14 March 2016. 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 20 May 2016.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. 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 education provider and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes; BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy - Part Time, MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) - Full time accelerated and Post Graduate Diploma in Occupational Therapy - Full time accelerated. 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 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 education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dawn Fraser (Occupational therapist) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Manoj Mistry (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	45 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2017
Chair	David Penman (University of Essex)
Secretary	Kirsty Sceats (University of Essex)
Members of the joint panel	Rebecca Khanna (College of Occupational Therapists) Joan Healey (College of Occupational Therapists) Clair Parkin (College of Occupational Therapists) Alex Whithair (Student panel member) Nicky Slee (Internal panel member) Lesley Wilson (External panel member)

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The visitors received the external examiners reports for the existing part time route for this programme.

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The visitors met with the students on the existing part time route for this programme.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval the visitors must be satisfied 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 the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining SET.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. 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 number of recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to ensure accurate and consistent information is provided regarding placement hours.

Reason: Within the programme documentation the visitors noted inconsistencies in the required placement hours stated. For example within the Practice Placement Handbook:

- page 11 states “The programme enables students to undertake a minimum of 1056 hours in practice...”;
- page 15 states “Students on the programme will undertake a minimum of 1000 hours in practice...”, and;
- page 38 states an outlined placement week of 37.5 hours across 28 weeks which totals 1050 hours

Also, the visitors noted that the placement hours as stated within each placement module have a combined total of 1073 hours + preparation for placement hours. In addition to this the visitors noted that the placement structure did not take into account any bank holidays throughout the year. The visitors note that bank holidays will impact on the number of hours that will be achievable in the stated timeframes. Without clarity of the required and available placement hours for the programme and a clear timeline of where placement hours are to be achieved, the visitors are unable to make a judgement on the duration of practice placements for this programme. The visitors therefore require documentation which clearly defines the required and available placement hours for the programme and that they are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Recommendations

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the current level of service user and carer involvement for the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and service user group, it was clear that there is currently a level of service user and carer involvement in the programme and appropriate support is in place for these members. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the level of involvement is minimal from service users and carers and this is currently on an ad hoc basis. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that service users and carers are involved and supported they considered that the current structure poses a risk to continued involvement for the programme. Specifically, the visitors noted that there is no formalised training identified for training service users and carers. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team considers reviewing the current level of service user and carer involvement for the programme.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the module descriptors to provide more clarity on the specific standards of proficiency (SOPs) being delivered within each module.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team it was clear that the SOPs are being delivered within the current modules. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the majority of module descriptors for the programme refer to the overarching SOPs as opposed to individual SOPs. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that the individual SOPs were being delivered from reviewing the SOPs mapping document, they considered the lack of detail within the module descriptors could pose a risk to future delivery of the modules. Specifically, the visitors noted that having this detail might better support any future changes to the programme including module updates and changes to programme staff. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team revisit the module descriptors to provide more clarity on the specific SOPs to be delivered within each module.

5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider strengthening the monitoring of attendance for practice placement educators when delivering new and refresher training.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and the practice placement providers, it was clear that the education provider runs regular training sessions for practice placement educators as well as ensuring a currency in their knowledge. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the monitoring of attendance of practice placement educators is currently minimal. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that practice educators are attending

appropriate training, they considered the level of monitoring of training could pose a risk to the future attendance of practice educators at required training sessions. Specifically the visitors noted that the programme team could better evaluate where any additional training may be delivered to those who could not attend. Therefore, the visitors recommend that the programme team revisits the current process for monitoring the attendance of practice placement educators when delivering new and refresher training.

Dawn Fraser
Joanna Goodwin
Manoj Mistry

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Programme name	Post Graduate Certificate in Mental Health Practice for Approved Mental Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part time
Type of programme	Approved mental health professional
Date of visit	12 – 13 January 2016

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

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 practitioners (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 24 February 2016 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 23 March 2016. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary 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 11 March 2016. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 20 May 2016.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals.

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered a different programme - Advanced University Diploma in Mental Health Practice for Approved Mental Health Professionals. A separate visitor report exists for this programme.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Frances Ashworth (Lay visitor) Graham Noyce (Approved mental health professional) Christine Stogdon (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort, one cohort per year inclusive of student numbers on the Advanced University Diploma in Mental Health Practice for Approved Mental Health Professionals
Proposed start date of programme approval	June 2016
Chair	Megan Thomas (University of Wolverhampton)
Secretary	Julie Heydon (University of Wolverhampton)

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the criteria for approving AMHP programmes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The education provider previously ran an AMHP programme and provided HCPC with external examiners reports for that programme.

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The education provider previously ran an AMHP programme and HCPC met with students who completed that programme. HCPC also met with students from the BA (Hons) Social Work programme and also students from the Best Interest Assessor programmes.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the criteria for approving 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 48 of the criterion have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining two criteria.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. Conditions are set when certain criteria have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the criterion 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 can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular criterion has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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 provide further evidence to demonstrate that the admissions materials are clear and provide applicants with the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: In the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted information for applicants. This included information about the admissions criteria, DBS checks and other information about the programme. The visitors learnt that there is a similar programme available to potential applicants which is delivered and assessed at academic level 6. The visitors also learnt that this programme is open for self-funding students. During the programme team meeting the programme team stated that;

- the education provider will assess and decide whether applicants will be enrolled on to this programme or;
- students will be enrolled on to the Post Graduate Certificate in Mental Health Practice for Approved Mental Health Professionals at academic level 7 and;
- the self-funding students will arrange their own placements through formal arrangements with relevant practice placement providers before they are enrolled on the programme.

However, the visitors could not find evidence about how this information regarding the different programmes and placement arrangements for self-funding students will be available to potential students. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the admissions materials are clear and provide applicants with the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

A.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and professional entry standards

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about the selection process in place for this programme and how potential applicants are informed about it.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted the entry criteria for the programme. From the documentation the visitors were unable to determine how students are selected to be recruited to the programme. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that potential applicants apply through the university admissions process by completing an online form. Students will be assessed and selected against the entry criteria by the admissions team. Additionally, the programme leader assesses application forms and selects students to be recruited to the programme. However, the visitors could not see this or any other information about the selection process in the documentation provided. Consequently, the visitors were unable to determine how applicants are made aware of the entry requirements and recruitment process for this programme. Therefore, the visitors require further

evidence about the selection process in place for this programme and how potential applicants are informed about it.

Frances Ashworth
Graham Noyce
Christine Stogdon

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Programme name	Advanced University Diploma in Mental Health Practice for Approved Mental Health Professionals
Mode of delivery	Part time
Type of programme	Approved mental health professional
Date of visit	12 – 13 January 2016

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

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 practitioners (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 24 February 2016 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 23 March 2016. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary 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 11 March 2016. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 20 May 2016.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals.

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered a different programme - Post Graduate Certificate in Mental Health Practice for Approved Mental Health Professionals. A separate visitor report exists for this programme.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Frances Ashworth (Lay visitor) Graham Noyce (Approved mental health professional) Christine Stogdon (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort, one cohort per year inclusive of student numbers on the Post Graduate Certificate in Mental Health Practice for Approved Mental Health Professionals
Proposed start date of programme approval	June 2016
Chair	Megan Thomas (University of Wolverhampton)
Secretary	Julie Heydon (University of Wolverhampton)

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the criteria for approving AMHP programmes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The education provider previously ran an AMHP programme and provided HCPC with external examiners reports for that programme.

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The education provider previously ran an AMHP programme and HCPC met with students who completed that programme. HCPC also met with students from the BA (Hons) Social Work programme and also students from the Best Interest Assessor programmes.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the criteria for approving 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 45 of the criterion have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five criteria.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. Conditions are set when certain criteria have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the criterion 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 can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular criterion has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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 provide further evidence to demonstrate that the admissions materials are clear and provide applicants with the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: In the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted information for applicants. This included information about the admissions criteria, DBS checks and other information about the programme. The visitors learnt that there is a similar programme available to potential applicants which is delivered and assessed at academic level 7. The visitors also learnt that this programme is open for self-funding students. During the programme team meeting the programme team stated that;

- the education provider will assess and decide whether applicants will be enrolled on to this programme or;
- students will be enrolled on to the Advanced University Certificate in Mental Health Practice for Approved Mental Health Professionals at academic level 6 and;
- the self-funding students will arrange their own placements through formal arrangements with relevant practice placement providers before they are enrolled on the programme.

However, the visitors could not find evidence about how this information regarding the different programmes and placement arrangements for self-funding students will be available to potential students. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the admissions materials are clear and provide applicants with the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

A.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and professional entry standards

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about the selection process in place for this programme and how potential applicants are informed about it.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted the entry criteria for the programme. From the documentation the visitors were unable to determine how students are selected to be recruited to the programme. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that potential applicants apply through the university admissions process by completing an online form. Students will be assessed and selected against the entry criteria by the admissions team. Additionally, the programme leader assesses application forms and selects students to be recruited to the programme. However, the visitors could not see this or any other information about the selection process in the documentation provided. Consequently, the visitors were unable to determine how applicants are made aware of the entry requirements

and recruitment process for this programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about the selection process in place for this programme and how potential applicants are informed about it.

C.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the criteria in section 2

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the learning outcomes for the programme allow students to meet the following criteria in section 2 approved mental health professional (AMHP):

- **3.1 Be able to evaluate critically local and national policy to inform AMHP practice.**
- **3.2 Be able to draw on, and evaluate critically, a range of research relevant to evidence-based AMHP practice.**

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included a mapping document indicating where in the curriculum criteria in section 2 AMHP will be delivered. The visitors noted that the learning outcomes (LO) in module 6so031 were mapped against the criteria mentioned above. LO one stated “Demonstrate analytical use of knowledge of the legal and policy context of mental health practice” and LO two stated “Demonstrate analytical use of knowledge of evidence-based practice”. From this information the visitors were unable to determine how the curriculum ensures students will be able to ‘evaluate critically’ to be able to meet the above criteria. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that the programme team do teach students to evaluate critically during the programme. However, the visitors did not see evidence to determine that, on successful completion of the programme, students are able to meet the above criteria. Therefore, the visitors need further evidence to be able to decide whether this standard is met or otherwise.

E.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the competencies set out in section 2 of the criteria

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that demonstrates that the assessment strategy and design ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the following criteria in section 2 approved mental health professional (AMHP):

- **3.1 Be able to evaluate critically local and national policy to inform AMHP practice.**
- **3.2 Be able to draw on, and evaluate critically, a range of research relevant to evidence-based AMHP practice.**

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included mapping document indicating where in the curriculum criteria in section 2 AMHP will be delivered and assessed. The visitors noted that the learning outcomes (LO) in module 6so031 were mapped against the criteria mentioned above. LO one stated “Demonstrate analytical use of knowledge of the legal and policy context of mental health practice” and LO two

stated “Demonstrate analytical use of knowledge of evidence -based practice”. From this information the visitors were unable to determine how the curriculum ensures students will be able to ‘evaluate critically’ to be able to meet the above criteria. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that the programme team do teach and assess students on how to evaluate critically during the programme. However, the visitors did not see evidence to determine students after completing the programme meet the above criteria. Therefore, the visitors need further evidence to able to decide whether this standard is met or otherwise

E.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about the assessment methods that measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted the assessment methods for the learning outcomes delivered by this programme. However, as stated in the conditions under criteria C1 and E1 the visitors could not determine how the two criteria of section 2 for approved mental health professionals will be delivered and assessed. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to determine how the assessment methods employed for this programme measure the learning outcomes.

Francis Ashworth
Graham Noyce
Christine Stogdon